

Classical Philology

Vol. V

April, 1910

No. 2

SOPHOKLES UND DIE SOPHISTIK

VON WILHELM NESTLE

Die griechischen Dichter haben sich immer als die Lehrer und Erzieher ihres Volkes betrachtet.¹ Darum nimmt, allen modernen ästhetischen Theorien zum Trotz, in allen Gattungen hellenischer Dichtung die Reflexion einen breiten Raum ein. Den Fragen, die auf aller Lippen schweben, mögen sie nun die Politik des Tages oder die tiefsten Probleme der Weltanschauung betreffen, geht der hellenische Dichter nicht aus dem Wege, sondern er sieht gerade darin seinen Beruf, im Kampf der Geister sein gewichtiges Wort in die Wagschale zu werfen. Im höchsten und ausgedehntesten Masse gilt dies von der dramatischen Poesie, und so sehen wir denn auch die drei grossen Tragiker, jeden in seiner Art, Stellung nehmen zu der grossen religiös-philosophischen Bewegung, deren Wellenschlag im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. von den Küsten Asiens sich gegen die Gestade des europäischen Griechenlands heranwälzte, um sie erst sachte zu überspülen, bald aber unaufhaltsam zu überfluten. Während der jüngste von ihnen, Euripides, keineswegs unbedenklich sondern unter schweren inneren Kämpfen, aber mit dem Wahrheitsmut persönlicher Ueberzeugung sich zum Herold der neuen Aufklärung macht, bewahren seine älteren Genossen ihr gegenüber eine ungleich grössere Zurückhaltung. Aber wenn man auch mit einem gewissen Recht den Intellektualismus des *Euripides* der religiösen Inbrunst des Aischylos und Sophokles gegenüberstellen kann, so zeigt sich doch

¹ Aristoph. *Frösche* 1065.

bei genauerem Zusehen ein sehr erheblicher Unterschied zwischen der Religiosität der beiden letztern Dichter. Viel mehr als mit Sophokles ist *Aischylos* geistesverwandt mit seinem Zeitgenossen *Pindar*: Pindars Prophetengeist schaute in gläubiger Hoffnung nach einem seligen Jenseits, das, wenn auch nach langen Mühen, dem müden Erdenwanderer als rettender Ruheport winkte, und die tiefsinnige Feuerseele des Tragikers rang dem Weltlauf trotz Sünde und Tod eine Theodizee ab, überzeugt von dem Dasein einer weisen Gottheit, die in dem hinter der Erscheinungswelt liegenden Dunkel in Gerechtigkeit die Fäden des Schicksals spinnt. Beide Dichter ergriffen mit Innigkeit die geläuterten religiösen Vorstellungen der orphischen *Mystik* und erhoben sich dadurch über den Volksglauben, dessen unreine Züge sie zu beseitigen, zu mildern oder mit schonendem Schweigen zu übergehen bestrebt waren, in einer wenn auch noch so pietätvollen Kritik.

Wesentlich anderer Art ist die Frömmigkeit des *Sophokles*. Wohl war auch er "der frömmsten einer,"¹ wohl lehnte auch er, wie Aischylos und Pindar, die philosophische Spekulation ab und war in einer Zeit, da die Grundfesten des Götterglaubens von dem Ansturm des Rationalismus ins Wanken gerieten, für die Förderung neuer Kulte, des Asklepios und mit ihm verwandter Heroen, tätig,² wohl hatte auch er, wie alle tieferen Naturen unter den Griechen, eine lebhaft empfundene Leid- und Not des irdischen Lebens, aber er hatte weder, wie jene Dichter, einen Blick für die ethische Unzulänglichkeit der Volksgötter, noch konnte er, so wichtig ihm auch der Glaube an ein Fortleben nach dem Tode war,³ sich entschließen, mit der orphischen *Mystik* die geläufigen Anschauungen der Hellenen über das Verhältnis von Leib und Seele, von Diesseits und Jenseits auf den Kopf zu stellen. Seinen Unsterblichkeitsglauben nährte er an den heimischen Mysterien von Eleusis und seine Vorstellungen von den Göttern decken sich im Wesentlichen mit den homerischen. Doch bedarf letzteres einer Einschränkung: es gilt nur, soweit es die Vorstellung vom objektiven Dasein und Wirken

¹ Schol. zu El. 831: καὶ γὰρ εἰς ἧν τῶν θεοσεβειστῶν.

² Philostr. Imag. 13. Vita, wozu A. Körte, Ath. Mitteil. XVIII (1893), S. 249, und XXI (1896), S. 311 ff. Vgl. auch seine Visionen des Asklepios (*El. Magn.* 256, 7 ff.) und Herakles (Cic. de div. i. 25, 54).

³ El. 244 ff.

der Götter betrifft, namentlich von der Stellung des Zeus, die bei ihm ganz die des homerischen Göttervaters ist und nicht wie bei Aischylos und Pindar auf Kosten der Selbständigkeit der anderen göttlichen Wesen in die eines mystischen Allgottes übergeht. Dagegen steht Sophokles subjektiv den Göttern mit ungleich größerer Ehrfurcht gegenüber als die homerischen Dichter, denen sie oft mehr Gegenstand künstlerischen Spieles als wirklicher Andacht sind. So ist seine Frömmigkeit einerseits naiv, insofern er sich, jeder Kritik der Religion entsagend, einfach auf den Boden des Volksglaubens stellt. Andererseits ist sie dennoch wohl überlegt: denn er sieht in den einzelnen Göttern übermächtige Wesen, deren oft grausames Walten zwar den Anforderungen der Menschen an eine Gerechtigkeit des Weltlaufs vielfach nicht entspricht,¹ die nun aber einmal im Besitz überlegener Stärke und unerforschlicher Weisheit sind und die daher ihren Willen immer durchsetzen. Die Götter sind alles, der Mensch nichts. "Die Würfel des Zeus fallen immer gut" und "dem klugen Spieler bleibt nichts übrig, als sich mit *seinem* Wurf zu bescheiden, seine Brettsteine entsprechend zu setzen und nicht über Unglück zu klagen."² Immerhin muss alles vermieden werden, was die Götter erzürnen kann, alles menschliche Tun muss im Gedanken an sie geschehen.³ So wird dem Dichter die Frömmigkeit (*εὐσέβεια*), die in seinen Augen schlechthin die höchste Tugend ist, zur vorsichtigen Götterscheu (*εὐλάβεια*).⁴ Die Religion, und zwar die zeitlich bedingte und geschichtlich bestimmte Religion seines Volkes, nicht ein hinter und über den Symbolen des Kultus stehendes und durch ein feineres sittliches Empfinden geläutertes religiöses Bewusstsein wie dem Aischylos und Pindar, ist ihm unbedingte Autorität. Diese, insofern sogar Freigeistern wie Xenophanes und Euripides einigermaßen verwandt, massen die Religion an der Sittlichkeit; Sophokles misst umgekehrt die Sittlichkeit an der Religion. In den beiden Versen des Sophokles (Thyest. fr. 226, 3):

Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ οὐδέν, ὅν ὑφηγοῦνται θεοί,

¹ Aletes fr. 103. Trach. 1264 ff., wo vielleicht die Ueberlieferung getrübt ist.

² Fr. 809. 861 (Nauck²); Das Bild vom Brettspiel auch bei Platon, Ges. x. 903 D. Vgl. auch die wie ein Selbstbekenntnis klingenden Verse Aj. 1036 ff.

³ Oid. tyr. 881.

⁴ *εὐσέβεια*, Phil. 1441 ff.; *εὐλάβεια*, El. 1334; Oid. Kol. 116, wozu Rohde *Psyche* II 238, 1.

und des Euripides (Bell. fr. 292, 7):

Εἰ θεοί τι δρῶσιν αἰσχρόν, οὐκ εἰσιν θεοί,

prallen in heftigem Stosse zwei Weltanschauungen auf einander, deren eine einen religiösen, die anderen einen ethischen Absolutismus proklamiert. Sophokles verfißt die Autorität der Religion und der göttlichen Offenbarung bis zur äussersten denkbaren Grenze und man müsste ihm in dieser Frage die tiefere Auffassung zuerkennen, wenn für ihn das Religiöse und das Sittliche im absoluten Sinn identisch wäre und als solches der geschichtlich bedingten Rechtssetzung und Sitte gegenüberstünde im Geist eines Sokrates und Platon sowie des Urchristentums: "man soll Gott mehr gehorchen als den Menschen." Dass dies nicht die Meinung des Sophokles ist, darüber darf man sich durch die "Antigone" nicht täuschen lassen; hier fällt allerdings die Erfüllung der Pietätspflicht gegen den toten Bruder, also eine sittliche Handlung, mit den *ἄγραπτα νόμιμα* der Religion (vs. 454) zusammen und steht dem sittlich verwerflichen und zeitlich beschränkten Recht des Königsgebots gegenüber. Andere Beispiele aber zeigen, dass eben der religiöse *νόμος*, d.h., die positive zeitgeschichtlich bedingte Religion, für Sophokles absolute Autorität hat und nicht nur jedes menschliche Recht sondern auch eine fortgeschrittene Sittlichkeit ihr untergeordnet wird. So ist ihm die Ausübung der Blutrache, die Aischylos zu einem ergreifenden Konflikt zwischen Religion und Sittlichkeit zu gestalten wusste und die Euripides als grausam und widersinnig ad absurdum führt, einfach ein den Göttern wohlgefälliges Werk¹ und mit den oben angeführten Vers aus dem "Thyestes" erhält ein Inzest—Thyestes sollte gemäss einem Orakelspruch mit seiner Tochter Pelopia einen Sohn als Rächer an seinem Bruder Atreus erzeugen—seine religiöse Sanktion. Und auch die "im himmlischen Aether erzeugten" *νόμοι ὑψίποδες* von denen ein Chorlied des "Oidipus tyrannos" (863 ff.) singt, sind für Sophokles nichts anderes als die Bräuche der herrschenden Religion; denn es handelt sich hier vor allem um eine Rechtfertigung der Mantik (896 ff.). So findet sich denn bei Sophokles im Unterschied nicht nur von Euripides sondern auch von Aischylos und Pindar keinerlei Kritik der herrschenden Religion,

¹ Soph. El. 961 ff.; Eurip. El. 974 ff.; Or. 508 ff. Vgl. H. Steiger, "Warum schrieb Euripides seine Elektra?" Philol. LVI (1897), S. 561 ff.

man müsste denn die schüchterne Polemik in einem Chorlied der "Antigone" (606), gegen eine einzelne Erzählung der homerischen Gedichte, dass Zeus sich dem Schlummer hingegen habe (Ξ 233), als solche gelten lassen.

Nicht die Religion und ihre Offenbarungen, sondern *der menschliche Wissenstrieb bildet für Sophokles den Gegenstand der Kritik*. Denn, es ist eben Götterwille, dass der Mensch nicht alles ergründet (fr. 833):

Ἄλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὰ θεῶν κρυπτόντων θεῶν
Μάθους ἂν, οὐδ' εἰ πάντ' ἐπεξέλθοις σκοπῶν.

Und die Worte, die den Telephos von der Erforschung seiner Abstammung abhalten sollen, dürfen wir wohl bei ihrer allgemeinen Fassung auch im allgemeinen Sinn verstehen (Alead. fr. 80):

Μὴ πάντ' ἐρεῖνα· πολλὰ καὶ λαθεῖν καλόν.¹

Ja an Goethes Wort, dass "das schönste Glück des denkenden Menschen sei, das Erforschliche erforscht zu haben und das Unerforschliche ruhig zu verehren," erinnert das Bruchstück (fr. 759):

Τὰ μὲν διδάκτὰ μανθάνω, τὰ δ' εὐρετὰ
Ζητῶ, τὰ δ' εὐκτὰ παρὰ θεῶν ἡτρησάμην.

Denn mochte auch Sophokles die Grenzen des menschlichen Wissens sehr viel enger stecken als Goethe und namentlich noch viel behutsamer sein hinsichtlich der Folgerungen aus der Erkenntnis für die gesamte Weltanschauung, dem *Lernen* an sich ist er nicht abhold und er fordert ähnlich einem Protagoras, Antiphon und dem sog. Anonymus Jamblich die Jugend auf, sich frühzeitig *Bildung* anzueignen (Phthiotid. fr. 632):

Νέος πέφυκας· πολλὰ καὶ μαθεῖν σε δεῖ
Καὶ πολλ' ἀκοῦσαι καὶ διδάσκεισθαι μακρά.²

Sophokles hat einen ausgesprochenen *Sinn für die Wirklichkeit*, der sich in einem lebhaften Naturgefühl (Oid. Kol. 668 ff.) und in einem nicht geringen Interesse an all den empirischen Kenntnissen äusserte, die der Grieche damals in dem Wort *ἱστορίη* zusammenfasste. Es ist

¹ Rohde, Psyche³ II. 280, 3.

² Welcker, Die griech. Trag. I. 207; Protag. fr. 3: ἀπὸ νεότητος δὲ ἀρξαμένους δεῖ μανθάνειν; Antiphon fr. 60: πρῶτον, οἶμαι, τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἱστοὶ παιδευσις κτλ.; Anon. Jambl. fr. 1, 2: ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὰδε εἶναι, ἐπιθυμητὴν γενέσθαι τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν, φιλόπορόν τε καὶ πρωϊότητα μανθάνοντα καὶ πολλὸν χρόνον αὐτῷ συνδιατελοῦντα.

eine Vermutung, die viel Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich hat, dass er selbst Arzt war, und der "Ajas," die "Trachinierinnen" und der "Philoktetes" legen von seiner *medizinischen Sachverständigkeit* Zeugnis ab, wobei einerseits sein physiologischer Naturalismus (z. B. in der Beschreibung der Wunde des Philoktet) bis an die Grenze des Zulässigen geht,¹ andererseits es wieder bezeichnend für den Dichter ist, dass er nicht wie Euripides und der Verfasser der Schrift, 'περὶ ἰπῆς νούσου' den Wahnsinn auf natürliche Ursachen zurückführt sondern an dem Volksglauben seines göttlichen Ursprungs festhält.² Seine Freundschaft mit Herodot, auf dessen Werk er an mehreren Stellen Bezug nimmt, beruhte gewiss auf dem gemeinsamen *Interesse für kulturgeschichtliche und geographische Forschung*. Schon sein "Triptolemos" muss, ähnlich der Erzählung der Io von ihren Wanderungen in Aischylos "Prometheus," einen langen geographischen Exkurs enthalten haben.³ Wie der ältere Tragiker kennt auch Sophokles die richtige u. a. von Anaxagoras angenommene Erklärung der Nilschwelle und die Anspielung der "Elektra" (62 ff.) auf Zalmoxis beruht ohne Zweifel auf Herodot.⁴ Der im Lauf des 5. Jahrhunderts aufgekommenen Theorie, dass der Kulturfortschritt hauptsächlich auf einzelnen menschlichen *Erfindungen* beruhe, die wir unter den Sophisten Gorgias und Kritias vertreten sehen,⁵ huldigte auch Sophokles, indem er nicht mehr wie Aischylos den Gott Prometheus sondern die (im Sinne der Griechen) geschichtliche Persönlichkeit des Palamedes in zwei Tragödien als Erfinder von nützlichen und unterhaltenden Dingen feierte⁶ und in dem bekannten Chorlied der "Antigone" (365) die τέχναι pries, freilich nicht ohne ausdrücklich auf die ihren Erfolgen gesteckten Grenzen hinzuweisen. Besonders aber nähert ihn der Sophistik seine meisterhafte Handhabung der *Sprache*, die bei ihm eine solche Fülle von *rhetorischen Figuren* aufweist, dass diese nicht mehr, wie bei Aischylos, einen

¹ Zielinski, "Exkurse zu den Trachinierinnen," Philol. LV (1896), S. 596 ff.

² H. Harries, Tragici Graeci qua arte usi sint in describenda insania (Diss. inaug. Kiel, 1891), p. 1 ss.

³ Tript. fr. 533, 541, 543, 545, 546.

⁴ Aisch. Hik. 561, fr. 293; Soph. fr. 797; Herod. ii. 22; Anaxag. bei Diels, Vorsokratiker², S. 310, No. 91; Zalmoxis: Herod. iv. 95 f.

⁵ Gorgias, Palamedes 30 f.; Platon, Gorg. 448 C (Polos), 462 B; Kritias El. fr. 2. 6; Sis. fr. 25, 13 (Diels).

⁶ Naupl. fr. 396, 398; Pal. fr. 438; Vgl. Aj. 1194 f., und Herod. I 68.

zufälligen Schmuck sondern einen wesentlichen Bestandteil seines Stiles bilden.¹ Ausserdem zeigt er sich in seiner Vorliebe für *Etymologien*, die er mit Herodot und Euripides teilt, von den Anfängen der Sprachforschung berührt und zwar von der Theorie des Herakliteers Kratylus, die in den *ὀνόματα* das Wesen der Dinge oder Personen ausgedrückt fand und die Platon in dem gleichnamigen Dialog erörtert.² Erinnern wir uns endlich, dass zur Zeit und unter dem Einfluss der Sophistik eine lebhafteste Fachschriftstellerei zu erblühen begann, von der wohl die *‘κανόν’* betitelte kunsttheoretische Abhandlung des Polykleitos das früheste Beispiel ist, so dürfen wir vielleicht in der von Sophokles verfassten *Schrift über den Chor* ein Seitenstück dazu aus dem Gebiet der Poetik sehen. Denn unbeschadet der dichterischen Inspiration war auch sein künstlerisches Schaffen bewusst und wohl überlegt, wie seine dramaturgischen Neuerungen und seine Aeusserung über Aischylos beweist, an dem er auszusetzen hatte, „dass er zwar das Richtige treffe, aber unbewusst.“³

Schon aus dem bisher Gesagten ergibt sich, dass die Stellung des Sophokles zur Sophistik nicht schlechthin eindeutig ist: er kann mit ihr eine kleine Strecke Weges gehen, soweit nämlich als sie sich lediglich mit empirischer Forschung befasst. Sobald sie sich aber anschickt, aus ihren Forschungsergebnissen die Folgerungen für die Weltanschauung und die praktische Lebensführung zu ziehen, scheiden sich die Wege. Der Dichter sieht dann in ihr die erklärte Feindin, vor deren umstürzlerischen Bestrebungen zu warnen, deren gefährliche Irrlehren zu bekämpfen er sich in Rücksicht auf alles, was ihm heilig ist, verpflichtet glaubt. Und es ist kein Zweifel, dass dieses *Verhältnis einer grundsätzlichen und heftigen Gegnerschaft gegen alles, was Aufklärung heisst*, dem Ideengehalt der Sophokleischen Dichtung sein eigentümliches Gepräge gibt. Dabei ist aber seine Polemik und Kritik, im Unterschied von Euripides, nur selten eine direkte, sondern—und darin zeigt sich der über-

¹ O. Navarre, *Essai sur la rhétorique Grecque avant Aristote* (1900), p. 107 ss.

² Antig. 110 f.; Aj. 430 ff. 904. 914. 574 f. 608; Schol. zu 430: *ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἀρχαϊστρικόν τὸ πρὸς τὰς ὀνομασίας ἐκφέρειν τὰς συμφοράς*. Oid. Tyr. 70. 603. 654. 1036; El. 962, wozu Ael. Var. Hist. 4, 26; Oid. Kol. 486 f. 1320 ff.; Tyro fr. 597.; fr. inc. 880 (nach a 62. c 340. 423. r 407).

³ Suidas s. v. Vita. Aristot. Poet. 4 p. 1449 a; Athen. I, p. 22 AB.

legene Künstler—meist eine indirekte, die in den Charakter und die Schicksale der handelnden Personen verlegt ist. Eine Prüfung der erhaltenen Tragödien und der Bruchstücke der verlorenen wird dieses allgemeine Ergebnis im Einzelnen bestätigen und vielleicht zugleich auch einige neue Anhaltspunkte für die Geschichte der uns leider so trümmerhaft überlieferten Sophistik gewähren.

Gleich das früheste der auf uns gekommenen Stücke, die "*Antigone*," ist in seiner ganzen Anlage eine Kriegserklärung gegen die Sophistik. Zwar machte der Dichter, der in dem Satyrspiel "*Inachos*" der Ueberlieferung folgend das goldene Zeitalter der Urmenschheit feierte (fr. 256), hier in dem berühmten Chorlied (332 ff.) der Aufklärung die Konzession, dass er einem schon von Xenophanes (fr. 18 Diels) aufgebrachten und von Protagoras, vermutlich in seiner Schrift *Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως* weiter ausgeführten Gedanken zufolge den Menschen als Ueberwinder der Natur und Schöpfer der materiellen und geistigen Gesittung, der Sprache und des Staates pries: eine Lehre, deren Reflexe wir auch sonst in der zeitgenössischen Litteratur wahrnehmen;¹ aber er gibt diesem Triumphgesang auf die Errungenschaften der Kultur eine ironische Wendung durch die Erinnerung an die Grenze, die der Tod aller menschlichen Macht und Wissenschaft ziehe, und durch die Warnung, dass die gewonnene Erkenntnis ebensogut zum Schlimmen wie zum Guten dienen könne.² Für das Erstere ist Kreon ein abschreckendes Beispiel, der Vertreter des aufgeklärten Despotismus, der sich mit seinem Machtgebot über die altheilige Sitte der Religion hinwegsetzen zu dürfen glaubt. Der Angelpunkt des Dramas ist auch der Angelpunkt der Polemik. Hatte die *Sophistik* einen *Gegensatz von Natur und Sitte* festgestellt und dem konventionellen Brauch, zu dem sie auch die Religion rechnete, das ungeschriebene Recht der Natur entgegengesetzt, so vollzieht *Sophokles* im schärfsten Widerspruch hiegegen die *Ineinssetzung von Natur und Sitte* und insbesondere von Natur und Religion. Gerade der ungeschriebene religiöse Brauch steht nach ihm, ewig und göttlich wie er ist, über allen Wandlungen geschicht-

¹ Platon, *Protag.* 320 C ff.; Eur. *Aiol.* fr. 27 (in der Form ähnlich Simonides von Keos, fr. 25); Plut. *De fort.* 3 p. 98 F (Anaxagoras); Xen. *Mem.* IV. 3; *Isokr.* 3, 5 ff.; *Krit. Sis.* fr. 25; Moschion fr. 6; Zur Form vgl. Aisch. *Choeeph.* 585 ff.

² F. Blass in *Fleckeisens Jahrbüchern für Philologie* 155 (1897), S. 477 ff.; W. Schmid, *Philologus* LXII (1903), S. 1 ff.

lichen Rechts und persönlicher Willkür der Menschen. Darum siegt er auch in dem Stücke und der durch das Unglück gebrochene Despot unterwirft sich dem bestehenden Brauch (1113 f.). Im Besonderen handelt es sich hier um die Verachtung des Totenkults, deren erste Spur sich bei Simonides von Amorgos (fr. 2) findet. Sophokles hält also den alten Begriff des *Nómos* als des gottgewollten und eben darum natürlichen Gesetzes fest, wie ihn Harakleitos von Ephesos (fr. 114 Diels), Empedokles (fr. 135), die Orphiker (fr. 109. 126. Hy. 64 Abel) und Pindar (fr. 169 Bergk) vertraten, wie ihn selbst der Chor der Euripideischen Bacchen (895 f.) in Uebereinstimmung mit Aischylos (Hik. 673) verteidigt und wie wir ihn noch bei Xenophon (Mem. IV. 4, 18–21) und—in unverkennbarem Anschluss an Pindar—bei dem merkwürdigen Anonymus Jamblich (fr. 6, 1 Diels) aufgefasst finden.¹

Diese Anschauung von der göttlichen Natur des *Nómos*, zumal des sittlich religiösen, verfehlt Sophokles mit aller Energie gegen die neue sophistische Theorie von der nur relativen Berechtigung des *nómos*, die namentlich Hippias unter Hinweis auf die Verschiedenheit ja nicht selten Gegensätzlichkeit gleich heilig gehaltener *nóμοι* bei verschiedenen Völkern begründet zu haben scheint. Aber schon vor ihm muss auch *Protagoras* die unbedingte Gültigkeit des *nómos* nicht nur im Sinn des Gesetzes sondern auch der Sitte und Sittlichkeit angefochten haben. Diese Polemik lag schon in seinem Fundamentalsatz vom Menschen als dem Mass aller Dinge beschlossen. Sie klingt uns entgegen aus dem Vers des Euripideischen Aiolos (fr. 19): *Τί δ' αἰσχρόν, ἢν μὴ τοῖσι χρωμένοις δοκῇ*; wo der Zusammenhang die Beziehung auf die den Griechen anstössige, aber im Orient teilweise übliche Sitte der Geschwisterehe nahelegt, die auch Hippias bei Xenophon (Mem. IV 4, 20) und der Verfasser der „Dialexis“ (2, 15) zugunsten seiner Theorie ins Feld führt.² Und Platon führt als Lehre des Protagoras an (Theait. 168 C): *οἷα γ' ἂν ἐκάστη πόλει δίκαια καὶ καλὰ δοκῇ, ταῦτα καὶ εἶναι αὐτῇ, ἕως ἂν αὐτὰ νομίζῃ*,

¹ Kaibel, De Sophoclis Antigona (1897), S. 27. Es ist daher ganz überflüssig, ja verkehrt, mit Joël (Der echte und der xenophontische Sokrates II 694 ff.; 1098 ff.) hier Gedankengut des Antisthenes zu suchen.

² Hippias denkt hier an ethnologische Verschiedenheiten, nicht an Verirrungen Einzelner, z. B., des Oidipus, wie P. Corssen, Die Antigone des Sophokles (1896) S. 26, 1 annimmt.

d.h. der Begriff des *δίκαιον* ist den Wandlungen des Zeitgeistes unterworfen. Dieser für die Sophistenzeit vortrefflich passende Gedanke findet sich nun wunderlicher Weise auch bei Aischylos "Sieben" 1070 f.: *καὶ πόλις ἄλλως ἄλλοτ' ἐπαινεῖ τὰ δίκαια*. Der Schluss dieses Stückes dreht sich bekanntlich um dieselbe Frage, wie die "Antigone," um die Berechtigung der Bestattung des Polyneikes; es ist aber undenkbar, dass Aischylos diese von Sophokles perhorreszierte Anschauung dem Halbchor der sie allerdings praktisch nicht befolgt, in den Mund gelegt haben sollte, und dies scheint mir ein weiterer gewichtiger Grund für die Unechtheit des Schlussteils der "Sieben" zu sein, den man neuerdings wieder zu verteidigen versucht hat.¹

Ausser der Hauptidee verraten aber auch noch eine Reihe von Einzelheiten Beziehungen zur Sophistik meist polemischer Art. Kreon zeigt sich u.a. auch darin als aufgeklärten Mann, dass er die *Mantik* verachtet und glaubt sich im Besitz der wahren *εὐβουλία*, die ihm Teiresias freilich abspricht (1050 ff.), während er eben dadurch ein Opfer der *ἄβουλία* (1242) wird. Genau mit diesem Worte bezeichnet aber Protagoras bei Platon (318 E) das Ziel seiner Lehre und Euripides (Hel. 757) ersetzt damit die *Mantik*: *Γνώμη δ' ἀρίστη μάντις ἢ τ' εὐβουλία*.² Was also für die sophistische Aufklärung *εὐβουλία* ist, das ist in den Augen des altgläubigen Sophokles *ἄβουλία*. Mit ihm erklärt sich Herodot in einer deutlichen Anspielung auf die *Καταβάλλοντες* des Protagoras für die Weissagung und gegen den modernen Unglauben (VIII. 77).³

Der Rationalist Kreon weiss ferner wohl, *ὅτι θεοὺς μαίνειν οὔτις ἀνθρώπων σθένει* (1043 f.)⁴ Dadurch dass Sophokles ihm, dem Frevler, diese Anschauung zuschreibt, gibt er seinerseits ebenso seinem Widerspruch dagegen Ausdruck, wie umgekehrt Euripides seiner Zustimmung, indem er sie den Theseus dem in seinem Wahnsinn zum Mörder gewordenen Herakles gegenüber als Trost aussprechen lässt (Herakl. 1232). v. Wilamowitz verweist dazu auf eine ähnliche in der Schrift *Περὶ ἱρῆς νούσου* sich äussernde Gesin-

¹ Wundt im *Philologus* LXV (1906), S. 357 ff., gegen v. Wilamowitz, *Drei Schluss-szenen griech. Dramen* in den *Sitzungsber. der Preuss. Ak. d. W.*, 1903, S. 436 ff.

² Und dem Sinn nach ähnlich Eur. fr. 973: *μάντις δ' ἀρίστος ὅστις εὐκαλεῖ καλῶς*.

³ Radermacher im *Rhein. Mus.* LIII (1898), S. 497 ff.

⁴ Vgl. Soph. *Aletas* fr. 100: *τὸ γὰρ καλῶς πεφυκὸς οὐδεὶς ἂν μαίνεϊν λόγος*.

nung und nennt die Worte einen "Spruch, der damals oft gegen den Glauben an physische *μιάσματα* vorgebracht werden mochte." Andere wollten ihn auf Xenophanes zurückführen, was nicht unmöglich ist, wofür aber schwerlich ein anderer Grund beigebracht werden kann als die Nachbarschaft Xenophanischer Ideen in der Tragödie des Euripides (Herakl. 1341 ff.). Ich glaube dagegen, dass auch hier eine Spur auf Protagoras führt. Im griechischen Volk lebte trotz der fortgeschrittenen Rechtsanschauungen der *Glaube an religiöse Befleckung* durch gewisse Vergehen oder Unglücksfälle, insbesondere durch freiwilliges oder unfreiwilliges Blutvergessen fort. Beweis dafür ist der Brauch, selbst gegen leblose Dinge, die den Tod eines Menschen verursachten, Prozesse zu führen.¹ Nun erzählt Plutarch (Perikl. 36), Perikles habe einmal mit Protagoras darüber disputiert, ob bei der unfreiwilligen Tötung eines Jünglings durch den Wurfspieß eines andern im Pentathlon der Wurfspieß, oder der, der ihn geworfen, oder die Kampfordner schuldig gewesen seien *κατὰ τὸν ὀρθότατον λόγον*? Es handelte sich also hier um die eventuelle Anerkennung eines sei es durch eine Sache oder durch einen Menschen bewirkten *μιάσμα* genau wie in dem mit diesem Fall identischen Schulbeispiel in der zweiten Tetralogie des Antiphon,² wo der Kläger auf seinen Strafantrag mit der Warnung schliesst: *μὴ περιορᾶν ἅπασαν τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ τοῦτου μαινομένην* (Tetr. Ba 2). Es kann kein Zweifel sein, dass Protagoras, der im Strafrecht überhaupt die Vergeltungstheorie bekämpfte und nur die Abschreckung und Besserung als Zweck der Strafe anerkannte,³ in dem vorliegenden Fall jede Schuld und ebenso jedes *μιάσμα* in Abrede zog. Und da in seiner Schrift *Περὶ θεῶν* ausser dem skeptischen Einleitungssatz (fr. 4 Diels) doch wohl auch noch einiges Weitere gestanden haben muss, da sich ferner bei seiner eben hier ausgesprochenen Scheu, etwas Positives über die Götter auszusagen, negative Bestimmungen noch am ehesten mit seinem Standpunkt vereinigen lassen, so scheint mir die Vermutung nicht zu gewagt, die von Euripides übernommene und von Sophokles bekämpfte Theorie, dass eine

¹ Demosth. gegen Aristokr. 76. Vgl. Soph. El. 483, wozu Zielinski, *Die Antike und Wir* (1906), S. 56.

² v. Wilamowitz, *Göttinger Programm* 1890; Th. Gomperz, *Griech. Denker I.* 358 f.; E. Szanto, *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen* (1906), S. 117.

³ Platon, *Prot.* 324 A. B.

Befleckung der Götter durch menschliches Handeln undenkbar sei, gehe auf die gemeinsame Quelle der Protagoreischen Schrift *Περὶ θεῶν* zurück.

Nicht mit gleicher Wahrscheinlichkeit lassen sich einige andere Stellen als Anspielungen auf die Sophistik deuten. Wenn der Chor (127 f.) vom Hass des Zeus gegen die *μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπτοι* spricht, so meint er damit sicherlich zunächst, wenn er ihn auch nicht nennt, Kapaneus, den Gefährten des Polyneikes; aber der Dichter konnte damit doch zugleich auf die *sophistische Rhetorik* zielen und im Volk konnte man dies ebenso gut verstehen als man bei der Aufführung von Aischylos "Sieben" in dem frommen Amphiaraios allgemein den Charakter des Aristeides erkennen zu müssen glaubte.¹

Wenn ferner Haimon den starren Sinn seines Vaters, der die für Antigone günstige *Volksstimmung* (700) ignorieren zu können glaubt, mit einem Baume vergleicht, der dem reissenden *Bergbach* (*ρείθροισι χειμάρροισι* 712) Widerstand leistet und eben deswegen mitfortgerissen wird, so erinnert das allerdings einigermaßen an die Aesopische Fabel 'κάλαμοι καὶ δρύς'² nur dass hier der Wind und nicht das Wasser den Baum entwurzelt, auch es ist doch wohl kaum blosser Zufall, dass Herodot in der merkwürdigen Verfassungsdebatte der sieben Perser genau das gleiche Bild vom *ἀκόλαστος δῆμος* und seiner hastigen Behandlungsart der Dinge gebraucht (III 81: *χειμάρρη ποταμῷ ἔκελος*). Schon früher hat E. Maass hiez u den Ausdruck des Isokrates (3, 16) *φέρεισθαι μετὰ τοῦ πλήθους* verglichen und aus hier nicht weiter zu verfolgenden Gründen auf eine Schrift des Protagoras als Quelle der politischen Erörterungen bei Herodot und Isokrates geschlossen,³ welch letzterer das Bild noch deutlicher an anderer Stelle (15, 172 *ὥσπερ χειμάρρους*) wiederholt. Es ist wenigstens nicht unmöglich, dass der zwar republikanisch aber aristokratisch gesinnte⁴ Sophokles dasselbe Bild für dieselbe Sache dem Sophisten entlehnt hat, so gut wie Herodot ein berühmtes Gleichnis aus dem *Ἐπιτάφιος* des Perikles an anderer Stelle zu werwenden sich nicht gescheut hat.⁵

¹ Aisch. 592 ff.; Plut. Arist. 3.

² Aisop. fab. 179; E. Bruhn zur Stelle.

³ Hermes XXII (1887), S. 586 ff.

⁴ Alead. fr. 87. Sophokles gehörte höchstwahrscheinlich 411 v. Chr. dem oligarchischen Kollegium der 10 Probulen an. Aristot. Rhet. III. 18, p. 1419 a 26 ff.

⁵ Herod. VII. 162; Aristot. Rhet. I. 7. III. 10 (Stein z. St.).

Längst bemerkt wurde die Uebereinstimmung zwischen dem von Kreon gesprochenen Verse (661) über die *Anarchie* (*ἀναρχίαν δὲ μείζον οὐκ ἔστιν κακόν*) und fr. 61 des Sophisten Antiphon: *ἀναρχίας δ' οὐδὲν κάκιον ἀνθρώποις*. Diels (Vorsokratiker², S. 602, 9) nimmt dafür kurzer Hand Entlehnung seitens des Sophisten aus der Tragödie an, während Bruhn (z. St.) auf einen alten durch Aristoxenos bei Stobäus Flor. XLIII. 49 überlieferten pythagoreischen Spruch verweist: *καθόλου δὲ φόντο (οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι) μηδὲν εἶναι μείζον κακὸν ἀναρχίας*. Allein die Aehnlichkeit zwischen Sophokles und Antiphon erstreckt sich über die kurz pointierte Sentenz hinaus auf deren Begründung: die Anarchie, meint Kreon, zerstört Staaten und Familien, während umgekehrt der Gehorsam (*ἡ πειθαρχία* 676) Haus und Staat erhält; und ebenso verlangt Antiphon Erziehung der Kinder zum Gehorsam. Eine Beziehung besteht also sicher; wem die Priorität zukommt mag vorerst dahin gestellt bleiben; doch sei gleich hier daran erinnert, dass der von Blass entdeckte sog. Anonymus Jamblichi hinsichtlich der Gesetzherrschaft und der *ἀνομία* (fr. 6, 1 und 7, 12 f.) ganz ähnliche Anschauungen hat wie Antiphon und wie Herodot (196 f.).¹

Noch niemand hat meines Wissens auf eine merkwürdige Uebereinstimmung zwischen einer Stelle der "Antigone" (1165 ff.) und Platons "Gorgias" (492 E) aufmerksam gemacht. Es handelt sich um den *Lebensgenuss*. Dort zieht der Bote, der Haimons und Antigones Tod meldet, aus dem Unglück, das die Königsfamilie betroffen hat, den Schluss, dass man das Glück des Augenblicks genießen müsse:

Τὰς γὰρ ἡδονὰς
Ὅταν προδῶσιν ἄνδρες, οὐ τίθημι' ἐγὼ
Ζῆν τοῦτον ἀλλ' ἔμψυχον ἡγοῦμαι νεκρόν.²

Und bei Platon meint Kallikles, der schon vorher (483 B) die Lebensweise des Sokrates mit derjenigen eines Sklaven verglichen hat, *ὃ κρείττον ἐστὶν τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν*, dass, wenn das Ideal des Lebens die Bedürfnislosigkeit wäre, *οἱ λίθοι ἂν οὕτω γε καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ εὐδαιμονέστατοι εἴεν*. Und ähnlich lesen wir im "Phaidon" (65 A):

¹ Näheres im Philologus LXVII (1908), S. 576 ff.

² Bei Simonides fr. 54, worauf E. Bruhn (z. St.) verweist, fehlt gerade die Hauptsache: der Begriff des *ἐμψυχος νεκρός*.

καὶ δοκεῖ γέ που τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀνθρώποις . . . ἐγγύς τι τείνειν τοῦ τεθνάναι ὁ μὴδὲν φροντίζων τῶν ἡδονῶν, αἱ διὰ τοῦ σώματός εἰσιν. Diese Meinung "der Menge" hat Sophokles dem Mann aus dem Volke geliehen, um seine niedrige Denkungsart als solche zu kennzeichnen; aber, wie man sieht, bekennt sich auch der Aristokrat Kallikles zu dieser Lebensauffassung der πολλοί. Seine Polemik richtet sich gewiss indirekt gegen den Kynismus;¹ aber hat er das drastische Gleichnis für seine gegenteilige Anschauung, dasselbe, dessen sich auch Sophokles bedient, von sich selbst oder ist es etwa ein Sprichwort wie das ὥσπερ λίθον ζῆν (494 A), worauf er auch hier anspielt? Sollte es nicht vielleicht wie die vorigen Beispiele der sophistischen Sphäre angehören, die ja Kallikles bei Platon darstellt? Wie Sokrates wenigstens mit diesem einen Zuge der Bedürfnislosigkeit bei Platon den kynischen Standpunkt vertritt, dessen extremes Ideal Platon selbst übrigens durch den κόσμος βίος (494 A-E) ersetzt wissen will, so verteidigt Sokrates auch bei Xenophon (Mem. I. 6, 1 ff.) die kynische Bedürfnislosigkeit gegen den Eudämonismus des Sophisten Antiphon, der ihn den "Lehrer eines Jammerlebens" (κακοδαιμονίας διδάσκαλος) nennt. Und derselbe Antiphon fordert in den erhaltenen Bruckstücken seiner Schrift 'Περὶ ὁμονοίας' (fr. 52. 53. 53a. 54 Diels) zum Genuss des so rasch verrinnenden Lebens und des äusseren Besitzes auf. Hat er auch der alten Aesopischen Fabel vom Geizhals (fab. 412, 412 b) durch die Einführung des Motivs des Geldleihens eine Wendung in sozialem Sinn geben,² so scheint doch dabei noch seine eudämonistische Lehre durch, und wenn dem Geizhals geraten wird, er sollte statt des ihm gestohlenen Goldes einen Stein vergraben, so sieht das aus wie eine Variation zu dem von Planton zitierten Sprüchwort.³ Eine Echo dieser den Genuss des Augenblicks empfehlenden Lehre haben wir auch noch bei Sophokles im "Tereus," fr. 534: ἀλλὰ τῶν πολλῶν καλῶν τίς χάρις, εἰ κακόβουλος φροντὶς ἐκτρέφει τὸν εὐαῖωνα πλοῦτον; und 536: ζῆν τις ἀνθρώπων τὸ κατ' ἡμᾶρ ὅπως ἥδιστα πορσύνων· τὸ δ' ἐς αὔριον αἰεὶ τυφλὸν ἔρπει, besonders aber bei Euripides (Antiope fr. 198) und bei Herodot (I 33), der den Kroisos

¹Joël, Der echte und der xenophontische Sokrates II. 670.

²E. Jakoby, De Antiphontis sophistae Περὶ ὁμονοίας libro (1908), pp. 12 ff.

³F. Dümmler, Akademika, p. 81.

zu ihrem Vertreter macht.¹ Wir haben hier also eine jedenfalls weitverbreitete Lebensanschauung vor uns, zu der Sophokles, Herodot, Euripides, Platon und Xenophon Stellung nehmen; der letztere nennt uns einen bestimmten Sophisten, Antiphon, mit Namen. Liegt es da nicht nahe, auf diesen auch die Bezeichnung seiner Gegner als *ἔμψυχοι νεκροί* zurückzuführen?

Fassen wir dies alles zusammen, so erweist sich die "Antigone" trotz gelegentlicher Anlehnung an sophistische Gedanken, soweit diese den Kreis der Erfahrung nicht überschreiten, als ein Werk, worin Sophokles sowohl mit der Grundidee als in zahlreichen Einzelheiten für den alten Glauben und die hergebrachte Religion als der Grundlage des staatlichen wie des individuellen Lebens, der Politik und der Ethik eintritt, und die neu aufkommende Sophistik bekämpft. Denn diese hat zwar ihre Hauptwirksamkeit allerdings erst im Zeitalter des Peloponnesischen Kriegs entfaltet; aber man darf nicht vergessen, dass ihr genialster Vertreter, Protagoras, schon an der Gründung von Thurioi (444 v. Chr.) zugleich mit Herodot, Hipodamos von Milet und Empedokles beteiligt war und im Hause des Perikles als dessen Freund und Erzieher seiner Söhne verkehrte.²

Auch die um einige Jahre jüngere, jedenfalls nach 438 verfasste³ Tragödie "Ajas" richtet polemische Spitzen gegen die Aufklärung. Die Idee des Stückes beruht auf der Absicht des Dichters, die Selbstsicherheit des Menschen gegenüber der Macht der Götter als nichtig zu erweisen. Und zwar ist hier die physische Kraft die Grundlage dieser falschen Sicherheit. Aber auch die *ὑβρις* des Ajas, dieser, "durch keine sittliche oder religiöse Empfindung gezügelten Heldenatur,"⁴ hat einen rationalistischen Einschlag: er ist ein Verächter der Götter, will sich ohne sie Ruhm erwerben und schlägt den Rat der Athene frivoler Weise in den Wind. Darin besteht seine Ueberhebung (*οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπων φρονῶν* 777) und dadurch hat er sich den

¹S. mein Programm: Herodots Verhältnis zur Philosophie und Sophistik (Schöntal in Württemberg 1908), S. 26 f. und meine in dieser Zeitschrift (Oktober, 1909, No. 4, S. 461 ff.) angezeigte Ausgabe des "Gorgias" S. 69, 19 und 117, 17.

²Diog. L. IX. 50; Plut. Cons. ad Ap. 33, p. 118 E (Prot. fr. 9 Diels); Plut. Per. 36; Platon Prot. 314 E. 315 A.

³Schol. zu Aj. 1197: *ἡ ἱστορία ἐν Κρήσσαις Εὐριπίδου*. Diese wurden mit "Alkmaion in Psophis," "Telephos" und "Alkestis" 438 aufgeführt. Vgl. Aj. 1102 mit Eur. Tel. fr. 723 (Nauck²). v. Wilamowitz, Berliner Klassikertexte V 2, S. 71, Anm. 1.

⁴L. Straub, Liederdichtung und Spruchweisheit der alten Hellenen (1908), S. 369.

Zorn der Göttin zugezogen (766 ff.). Deshalb fasst sie ihn gerade an der Eigenschaft, die seinen höchsten Stolz bildet, an seiner Tapferkeit, und lenkt diese in dem über ihn verhängten Wahnsinn auf einen ganz unwürdigen Gegenstand. Dabei ergreift Sophokles die Gelegenheit, durch seine Darstellung des Wahnsinns seiner Ueberzeugung vom göttlichen Ursprung dieser Krankheit Ausdruck zu geben im Gegensatz zu ihrer Erklärung als einer natürlichen Erscheinung, wie sie der Verfasser der Schrift *Περὶ ἰρῆς νόσου* und Euripides in mehreren Dramen vertritt.¹ Im Einzelnen erinnern namentlich zwei Enthymeme an sophistische Gedankengänge: die Art wie Ajas (666 ff.) sein Nachgeben gegen die Götter und die Atriden mit der allgemeinen Erwägung von der Ueberlegenheit des Stärkeren begründet und mit Beispielen aus der Natur belegt, entspricht ganz der Rechtfertigung, die *Gorgias* der von der Macht des Eros besieigten Helena zuteil werden lässt auf Grund des Naturgesetzes vom Obsiegen des Stärkeren (Hel. 6).² Zweitens klingt in der Aeussung des Chors (157 ff.), wonach in einem Gemeinwesen die Kleinen nicht ohne die Grossen (und umgekehrt) bestehen können und darum der *φθόνος* der Geringen gegen die Mächtigen töricht ist, schon einigermassen die organische Staatsidee an, die durch die *sophistische Litteratur* *Περὶ ὁμονοίας* (vgl. Antiphon fr. 58) angebahnt wurde und die auch bei dem in ethisch-politischen Fragen nicht selten von seinem Landsmann Protagoras abhängigen Demokrit zum Wort kommt: z.B. fr. 250 *ἀπὸ ὁμονοίης τὰ μεγάλα ἔργα καὶ ταῖς πόλεσι τοὺς πολέμους δυνατόν κατεργάζεσθαι, ἄλλως δ' οὐ*. Und die Unterstützung der wirtschaftlich Schwachen durch die Leistungsfähigen verlangt fr. 255 und verspricht als Folge: *τοὺς πολίτας ὁμονόους εἶναι*. Platon vollends vergleicht den Staat mit einem Organismus, den Staatsmann mit dem Arzt oder jenen mit einem Bauwerk, diesen mit einem Baumeister, der, wenn er das Ganze erhalten will auf das Kleine und Grosse sehen muss (Ges. X 902 D): *οὐδενὶ χωρὶς τῶν ὀλίγων καὶ σμικρῶν πολλὰ ἢ μεγάλα. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄνευ σμικρῶν τοὺς μεγάλους φασὶν οἱ λιθολόγοι λίθους εὖ κείσθαι*.³ Am stärksten

¹E. Harries a. a. O. S. 9.

²Ebenso nimmt Jokaste in Eurip. *Phoin.* 541 ff. die Beweise für die politische *ισότης* aus der Natur.

³F. Dümmler, *Prolegomena zu Platons Staat* (1891), S. 11, 1.

freilich macht sich der Einfluss der Sophistik in dem letzten Teil des Stückes bemerkbar. Wir haben hier (von v. 1047 an) eine *ἄμιλλα λόγων* in der Manier des Euripides, der selbst in der Komposition dieser *Redewettkämpfe* wieder von der eristischen Kunst des Protagoras abhängig ist. Die *'σοφίσματα'* dieses Teiles waren schon den Alten anstössig und neuere Gelehrte haben aus demselben Grund die Echtheit der ganzen Schlusspartie angefochten, die jedoch durch die Verse 827 ff. deutlich vorbereitet ist.¹ Das Hauptthema des Agons ist dasselbe wie in der "Antigone": Recht und Pflicht der Totenbestattung. Wie dort Kreon so glaubt hier Menelaos, mit seinem vom Chor gerügten *γυνῶμαι σοφαί* (1091 f.) sich bei einem Feinde über die religiöse Sitte hinwegsetzen zu dürfen (1132), und wie der thebanische König zeigt sich Menelaos als den aufgeklärten Herrscher, der mit Protagoras weiss, dass der Bestand eines Gemeinwesens auf Furcht und Achtung vor den Gesetzen beruht.² Ebenso glaubt sich Agamemnon als *τύραννος* jeder Rücksicht auf die *εὐσέβεια* überhoben (1350), während Teukros als der pietätvolle Verteidiger der religiösen Tradition erscheint. Auch der Charakter des Odysseus hebt sich von dem dunkeln Hintergrund der selbstsüchtigen Atriden leuchtend ab. Wenn er *γνώμη σοφός* (1374) genannt wird, so bedeutet dies, anders als bei Menelaos (1091 f.), hier nur ein Lob. Dass er im Munde des Ajas ein verschlagener Fuchs und Schuft heisst (103 ff. 445), erklärt sich aus dem persönlichen Grimm des Helden und seine Bezeichnung als Abkömmling des Sisypchos durch den Chor (190) folgt nur einer alten Tradition. Dagegen charakterisiert ihn der Dichter als eine mitleidsvolle (121 ff.), vornehme und rechtlich gesinnte Natur (1335), wie er denn auch schliesslich dem Gegner ein ehrliches Begräbnis verschafft (1376). Innerhalb des grossen Agons ist dann noch eine kleine Disputation über den Wert des Bogenschützen und Hopliten (1120 ff.) ähnlich der im "Herakles" des Euripides (159 ff.) enthalten, worauf die rhetorische Antithese der beiden *αἰνοί* des Menelaos und Teukros (1142 ff. 1150 ff.) folgt und das von letzterem schon früher (1093 ff.) berührte Thema vom Wert oder Unwert edler Abstammung zu einem förmlichen Redestreit

¹ Schol. zu Aj. 1123; Bergk, Griech. Litt. III. 381 ff.

² Aj. 1073 ff., wozu vgl. Protag. 322 D, 324 B: Antig. 661; Antiph. fr. 61; Anon. Jambl. fr. 6. 7; Schol. zu Aj. 1091: τὰ περὶ τῆς εὐπειθείας ἀριστα.

zwischen Agamemnon und Teukros ausgesponnen wird (1223 ff.), obgleich dieser im Grunde nur nachweisen will, dass er ebenso gut königlicher Abkunft sei wie die Atriden. Dabei sind für Agamemnon die Edlen (*εὐγενεῖς*) zugleich auch die "Vernünftigen" (*φρονούντες* 1252. 1256), die auf die derben Kraftnaturen (*παχεῖς καὶ εὐρυνώτοι* 1250 f.) der Niedriggeborenen (1228. 1259) herabsehen, während nach Teukros auch die Edlen gar oft das Rechte verfehlen (1095 f.). Wir sehen sonst im "Ajas" den Dichter sich in weitgehendem Masse der formalen Methode der Sophistik bedienen, so dass er gewisse Fragen geradezu zur Debatte stellt; aber auch sachlich berührt er mit dem Streit um die *εὐγένεια* ein Thema, das dem in sophistischen Kreisen viel erörterten Problem, ob *φύσις* oder *παιδεία* das Wichtigere sei, wenigstens nahesteht.¹

Geradezu als ein apologetisches Tendenzstück kann man den "Oidipus Tyrannos" bezeichnen. War es in der "Antigone" und im "Ajas" nur eine einzelne Seite der Religion, der Totenkult, wofür der Dichter eintrat, so bezweckt der "Oidipus" nicht mehr und nicht weniger als eine *Rettung der Religion und ihrer Offenbarungen, der Mantik*, mit der jene nach des Sophokles Auffassung steht und fällt. Es ist bemerkenswert dass in dieser Tragödie im Unterschied von der "Antigone" der Geschlechtsfluch im Haus der Labdakiden ausgeschaltet und durch die dem Laios und Oidipus gewordenen übereinstimmenden Orakel ersetzt ist.² Mit der grössten Emphase, deren er fähig ist, predigt der Dichter in diesem Stück die *Lehre von der Allmacht der Götter und der Nichtigkeit des Menschen*. Wie er im "Ajas" die Selbstsicherheit der Kraft als eitel erwiesen hatte gegenüber göttlicher Macht, so ist es hier die Selbstsicherheit der Klugheit, der, ihre Nichtigkeit zum Bewusstsein gebracht werden soll: für die trügerische *Selbstüberhebung des Verstandes* ist Oidipus das erschütternde Beispiel (*παράδειγμα* 1191). Künstlerisch dargestellt wird die Idee des Stücks im Charakter des Oidipus und der Jokaste, unmittelbar ausgesprochen wird sie vom Chor im zweiten Stasimon.

Der Grundzug im Charakter des *Oidipus* ist neben seiner Leiden-

¹ Protag. fr. 3 und bei Plat. Prot. 323 C ff.; Prodikos bei Xen. Mem. II 1, 27; Antiphon fr. 60; Anon. Jambl. fr. 1, 2; Kritias fr. 9. 22. Die Stellen bei Euripides s. in meinem Buche über diesen (1901), S. 176 ff. 324 ff.; Isokr. Euag. 12 ff.

² E. Bruhn, Einleitung zur Antigone¹⁰ (1904), S. 9. Nur folgt daraus nicht, dass der Oid. Tyr. älter sei als die "Antigone."

schaftlichkeit das Pochen auf seine Klugheit, eine Eigenschaft, die schon in der Ueberlieferung gegeben war.¹ Er hält sich für seines Glückes Schmied und glaubt, dadurch dass er Korinth verliess, die Erfüllung des Orakels vereitelt zu haben (788 ff.). Er ist nicht nur im Munde anderer (502.509) der weise (*σοφός*), berühmte (1207) und mächtige (1525) Oidipus, sondern er nennt sich auch selbst so (8) und rühmt sich, durch eigene Klugheit, ohne Götteroffenbarung (*γνώμη κυρήσας οὐδ' ἂπ' οἰωνῶν μαθὼν* 398) das Rätsel der Sphinx gelöst zu haben, bei dem die Seherkunst des Teiresias versagte. Und dass die Lösung dieses Rätsels gerade "der Mensch" ist, Oidipus also glaubt, über diesen im Klaren zu sein, ist auch nicht ohne Bedeutung. Mit grosser Kunst lässt der Dichter diesen seiner selbst sicheren Verstandesstolz des Königs, vermöge dessen er sich über die populäre Religion und die von dieser gebotenen Förderungsmittel des Lebens, wie die Mantik, im Stillen erhaben dünkt, erst allmählich im Verlauf des Stücks hervortreten. Und auch dann ist es noch kein prinzipieller Zweifel an der Mantik, den Oidipus äussert, sondern nur ein persönliches Misstrauen gegen Teiresias im Besonderen: eine Unterscheidung zwischen dem einzelnen Seher und der Mantik als solcher, die mehrfach vorkommt und der auch der Chor sich unbedenklich anschliesst.² Wenn Oidipus später (964 ff.) seinen Zweifel auch auf das Orakel in Delphi ausdehnt, so geschieht das nur unter dem Eindruck der Nachricht vom Tode des Polybos und der von Jokaste daraus gezogenen Folgerungen.

Denn Jokaste ist es, die der Dichter zur *Trägerin des prinzipiellen Zweifels an der Mantik und damit an der Religion* überhaupt gemacht hat. Zwar bedient auch sie sich, um die gute Sitte zu wahren, der oben gekennzeichneten Unterscheidung (711 f.); wie wenig es ihr aber damit ernst ist, geht daraus hervor, dass sie gleich darauf erklärt, das Orakel des Apollon an Laios habe sich nicht erfüllt und man brauche sich daher um Weissagungen nicht zu kümmern (720 ff.; vgl. 857 f.). Wenn sie im dritten Epeisodion ihre Zuflucht zu den Göttern und speziell zu Apollon nimmt (911 ff.), so geschieht dies lediglich zur Beruhigung des geängstigten Königs. Die Botschaft

¹ Pindar, *Pyth.* 4, 263.

² *Oid. Tyr.* 354 ff. 370 f. 435 f. 461 f. 497 ff. Vgl. *Eur. El.* 399 f. *Phoin.* 954 ff. Dies war wohl auch die eigene Ansicht des Sophokles. v. Wilamowitz im *Hermes* 34 (1899), S. 60.

vom Tode des Polybos bestärkt sie in ihrem Unglauben und sie spricht es nun ohne alle Einschränkung aus, dass "die Weissagungen der Götter" nichtig seien (946 f. 952 f.). Ja, sie geht noch einen Schritt weiter (977 ff.): mit der Mantik, die ihr mit dem Aberglauben der Traumdeuterei auf einer Stufe steht,¹ fällt für sie auch der Vorsehungsglaube: an die Stelle der *πρόνοια* tritt die *τύχη* und als der einzig richtige Lebensgrundsatz ergibt sich daraus für sie der Genuss des Augenblicks (*εἰκῇ ζῆν*). Während also Oidipus nur vorübergehend in seinem Glauben wankt, "liegt die Frivolität Jokastes am Tage."²

Dieser Unterschied im Charakter und in der Anschauung des Königs und der Königin tritt auch in ihrem Verhalten nach der Entdeckung der furchtbaren Wahrheit deutlich hervor: Oidipus kehrt zum religiösen Glauben zurück, was er auch durch die selbst-auferlegte Strafe der Blendung und der Verbannung beweist (1369 ff.); für Jokaste dagegen bleibt nach dem vergeblichen Versuch, die Enthüllung des Geheimnisses zu verhindern (1060 ff.), nur der Entschluss übrig, das Leben zu verlassen, das seinen Wert für sie verloren hat.

Dass wir damit nicht dem Dichter Gedanken unterschieben, die ihm fern lagen, beweist mit schlagender Deutlichkeit das *Chorlied in der Mitte des Stücks*, das den *Herzpunkt der ganzen Tragödie* bildet (863 ff.). In diesem Chorlied werden Glaube und Unglaube einander gegenübergestellt. Dem Glauben im Sinne des Dichters beruht die Religion auf ewigen, unwandelbaren göttlichen Gesetzen, denselben, für die auch Antigone in den Tod geht, Gesetzen, die mit irdisch menschlicher Natur nichts zu tun haben (865 ff.). Nicht bloss wer mit der Tat, sondern auch, wie wiederholt (864. 884) betont wird, wer selbst nur mit Worten sich gegen sie vergeht, ist ein Frevler (873 ff. 884 ff.). Und genau wie im Gang des Stückes Jokaste vom Zweifel an der Mantik zur Verwerfung des Vorsehungsglaubens und damit der Religion im Ganzen fortschreitet, so wird hier die Wahrheit und Gültigkeit der Religion auf die Wahrheit und Gültigkeit der

¹ Oid. Tyr. 981 ff. mit deutlicher Anspielung auf Herod. VI. 107. Zur politischen und strategischen Bedeutung der Traumdeuterei vgl. Diodor XIII. 97, 6; Radermacher im Rhein. Mus. 53 (1898), S. 500.

² v. Wilamowitz a. a. O. S. 59.

Mantik begründet. Wozu der dionysische Reigen (896), wenn frevle Hand und frevle Rede das Heilige antastet? Wenn die Orakel sich nicht *allen* Menschen als wahr erweisen (902), dann ist es aus mit Abai und Olympia, dann ist die Herrschaft des Zeus in Gefahr (898 ff.). Wenn die Autorität und Ehre Apollons wankt, dann ist es aus mit der Religion (*ἔρπει τὰ θεῖα* 910). Aber im Gegensatz dazu bleibt der Chor bei seinem Entschluss, niemals von Gott zu lassen (*θεὸν οὐ λήξω ποτὲ προστάταν ἰσχυῶν* 881).

Dem Eindruck, dass der Dichter mit diesem Chorlied über die an der Handlung des Stücks beteiligten Personen hinweg unmittelbar zu den Zuschauern redet, kann sich niemand entziehen. Und wie dieses Chorlied so ist die ganze Tragödie, noch in höherem Mass als die "Antigone," ein *Bekenntnis des Dichters*. "Die Religion ist in Gefahr": das ist seine Ueberzeugung und mit der ganzen Kraft seines Glaubens tritt er für sie in die Schranken. Durch die Darstellung der erschütternden Schicksale des Oidipus, die ja für ihn und sein Volk nicht Sage sondern Geschichte waren, will Sophokles den Wissenstolz demütigen, den Zweifel schrecken und den wankenden Glauben aufrichten. Was in der kongenialen modernen Nachahmung seiner Tragödie die Königin Isabella mit bitterem Sarkasmus ausruft, das als tiefsten Eindruck bei seinen Zuhörern zu erzielen, ist ihm heiliger Ernst:

Bei Ehren bleiben

Die Orakel und gerettet sind die Götter.

Wo ein Glaube mit solcher Leidenschaftlichkeit verteidigt wird, muss die Frage aufgeworfen werden, woher ihm Gefahr drohte. Der *Anlass* zur Rettung der Religion und besonders der Mantik kann für Sophokles in den allgemeinen Zeitverhältnissen gelegen haben; es können aber auch bestimmte litterarische Angriffe auf den religiösen Glauben ihn in die Verteidigungsstellung gedrängt haben.

Was die *Zeitverhältnisse* betrifft, so wissen wir, dass der Ausbruch der Pest in Athen am Anfang des Peloponnesischen Krieges auch der Religion einen starken Stoss versetzt hat. Wohl glaubte man einerseits in dem Auftreten der Epidemie ein altes Orakel erfüllt zu sehen (Thuk. II. 54, 2); andererseits gewährte man aber auch mit Schrecken, dass die religiösen Mittel, besonders auch die Orakel, zu denen man seine Zuflucht nahm, völlig versagten (II. 47, 4). Die Folge war

eine weitgehende Vernachlässigung des Kultus (II. 52, 3) und ein Schwinden der religiösen Gesinnung (II. 53, 4). Braucht auch der "König Oidipus" wegen der darin geschilderten Pest die athenische Epidemie nicht notwendig vorauszusetzen, so kann doch auch nicht geleugnet werden, dass die nach dem Bericht des Thukydides weite Volkskreise erfassende Irreligiosität jener schlimmen Jahre ganz der Stimmung und Gesinnung entspricht, die Sophokles namentlich in jenem Chorlied bekämpft.¹

Freilich die *Angriffe auf die Volksreligion* waren beträchtlich älter und im Perikleischen Athen waren freigeistige Anschauungen, so sehr solche auch noch die Masse perhorreszierte, auch schon vor dem grossen Krieg wenigstens in den gebildeten Kreisen verbreitet. Die Mantik insbesondere hatte schon Xenophanes verworfen. Anaxagoras setzte, unbeschadet seines *Noûs*, in solchen Dingen an die Stelle der religiösen Teleologie die physikalische Kausalität, und es ist höchst wahrscheinlich, dass auch Protagoras trotz seines religiösen Agnostizismus und obwohl er in der Natur eine gewisse Zielstrebigkeit anerkannte, in einer seiner Schriften, wie oben erwähnt, ebenfalls gegen die Mantik Stellung nahm, die seiner verständigen Lebenskunst (*εὐβουλία*) entbehrlich war. Euripides und Thukydides dachten, vermutlich im Anschluss an ihn, ebenso, während wir Herodot wie Sophokles gegen die Verachtung der Mantik protestieren sahen.² Dieser ganzen aufklärerischen Strömung, die mit dem blossen Menschenverstande das Leben beherrschen zu können glaubte, wirft sich Sophokles entgegen. Die Worte aber, in die er Jokaste ihren Unglauben zusammenfassen lässt, scheinen mir noch auf einen bestimmten Sophisten hinzuweisen. Sie lauten (977 ff.):

Τί δ' ἂν φοβούτ' ἄνθρωπος, ᾗ τὰ τῆς τύχης
Κρατεῖ, πρόνοια δ' ἐστὶν οὐδενὸς σαφής;

¹ Schon A. Schöll, Sophokles (1842), S. 179 bemerkt scharfsinnig, dass v. 56 die Worte *οὔτε ναὺς* besser auf Athen als auf Theben passen. Da Vers 629 von Aristoph. Ach. 27 und Eupolis fr. 205, 2 parodiert wird, dürfte das Stück nicht allzu lang vor 425 zu setzen sein.

² Xenophanes: Cic. de div. I. 3, 5; Anaxagoras: Plut. Per. 6; Protagoras: Agnostizismus fr. 4 (Diels). Zielstrebigkeit: im Mythos bei Platon Prot. 320 ff., wo 321 B mit Herod. III 108 zu vergleichen ist (Philologus LXVII 1908. S. 553 f.). *εὐβουλία*: 318 E. Stellung zur Mantik s. o. S. 12; Thuk. II. 54, 3. V. 26. VII. 50. VIII. 1; Espinas im Archiv für Philosophie VI (1893) S. 504.

Ἐκὴν κράτιστον ζῆν, ὅπως δύναιτό τις.

. . . ἀλλὰ ταῦθ' [sc. ὀνειράτα καὶ μαντεύματα] ὅτῳ

Παρ' οὐδέν ἐστι, ῥᾶστα τὸν βίον φέρει.

Die drei Merkmale, die Jokastes aufgeklärte Weltanschauung kennzeichnen: Verwerfung des Vorsehungsglaubens, Ablehnung der Mantik und Aufforderung zum Genuss des Augenblicks, finden wir sämtlich vereinigt in der Lehre des Sophisten *Antiphon*. Von ihm wird uns ausdrücklich berichtet, dass er in seiner Schrift *Περὶ ἀληθείας*, worin er den eleatischen Gottesbegriff adoptiert zu haben scheint (fr. 10), "die Vorsehung aufgehoben" habe.¹ Es ist selbstverständlich, dass sich hiemit die Ueberlieferung, er sei Traumdeuter gewesen und habe sogar über diese Kunst ein Buch verfasst, nur dann verträgt, wenn man annimmt, dass Antiphon seine Anschauung geändert hat. Es ist nun eine oft beobachtete Erscheinung, dass Leute, die einen Glauben aufgegeben haben, diese ihre frühere Ansicht um so heftiger bekämpfen, wofür Diagoras von Melos ein Beispiel aus jener Zeit ist.² Und in der Tat haben wir zwei Aeusserungen Antiphons, die nichts weniger als Hochachtung vor der Mantik bezeugen. Die eine klingt wie heller Hohn: *Οἰωνισαμένου τινός, ὅτι κατέφαγεν ὕς τὰ δελφάρια, θεασάμενος αὐτὴν ὑπὸ λιμοῦ διὰ μικροψυχίαν τοῦ τρέφοντος κατισχυαμμένην· χαίρει, εἶπεν, ἐπὶ τῷ σημεῖ, ὅτι οὕτω πεινώσα τὰ σὰ οὐκ ἔφαγεν τέκνα*. Die zweite Anekdote besagt, Antiphon habe auf die Frage, was Mantik sei, geantwortet: *ἄνθρωπου φρονίμου εἰκασμός*.³ Das ist genau die Formel der rationalistischen Aufklärung für die Mantik, wie sie wörtlich in dem oben angeführten Bruchstück des Euripides (fr. 973) wiederkehrt und dem Sinn nach in dem ebenfalls schon zitierten Vers der "Helena" (757) enthalten ist. Wenn an der letzteren Stelle die Mantik durch die *γνώμη* ersetzt wird, so entspricht auch dies genau dem rationalistischen Erkenntnisprinzip Antiphons (fr. 1. 2. 3.)

¹Orig. contr. Cels. 4, 25 bei Diels Ant. fr. 12. Dass *πρόνοια* hier "im praktisch menschlichen Sinn" d. h. als "Absicht," "freier Wille" zu verstehen sei, wie Joël, Sokr. II. 647 ff. ausführt, aber nur mit Stellen aus den Reden des Rhamnusiers Antiphon, den er mit dem Sophisten identifizieren will, belegen kann, ist durch den Zusammenhang bei Origenes ausgeschlossen. Vielmehr bedeutet es, "göttliche Vorsehung": vgl. Soph. Trach. 822, Herod. III. 108. Zum Gedanken: Aisch. Ag. 369. 682; Choeph. 606; Xen. Mem. I 4, 6.

²Th. Gomperz, Griech. Denker I. 328, 463.

³Diels, Vorsokrat.², S. 591 No. 8 und 9.

und auf seine *γνώμη* gestützt löste, wie wir sahen, auch Oidipus das Rätsel der Sphinx. Endlich proklamierte Antiphon, was gleichfalls schon berührt wurde, eine eudämonistische Ethik, die eines, übrigens auf einen verständigen Egoismus begründeten, sozialen Elementes zwar nicht ganz entbehrte, aber doch den Genuss des Augenblicks empfahl wie Jokaste das *εἰκὴ ζῆν*. Ja er soll seine Lebenskunst zu einer förmlichen *τέχνη ἀλυσίας* ausgebildet haben.¹ Dieser Versuch, das Leid des Lebens, dessen Schwere Antiphon keineswegs verkannte, durch verstandesmäßige Erwägungen und darauf gegründetes besonnenes Handeln bannen zu wollen, musste in der Tat als der Gipfel eines verwegenen Rationalismus erscheinen. Konnte man diesem kecken Unterfangen einer sich selbst überschätzenden Aufklärung in grossartigerer Weise entgegentreten als es Sophokles mit seiner Oidipustragödie tat, deren erschütternder Inhalt sich wie bitterer Hohn auf solch himmelstürmenden Vernunft-hochmut ausnimmt? An Antiphon also, der zu den ältesten Sophisten gehört zu haben erscheint,² und an Seinesgleichen mag Sophokles bei den der Jokaste in den Mund gelegten Versen gedacht haben. Aber er widerlegte seine Gegner nicht als Philosoph sondern als Künstler, so wie auch der moderne Dichter der Poesie lehrhaft zu sein erlaubt:

Sittlich sei der Poet, kein Sittenprediger. Lehren

Soll er, allein nur so, wie die Geschichte belehrt;

Hat er ein ewig Gesetz in geschlossenem Bild euch entfaltet,

Sei ihm die trock'ne Moral drunter zu schreiben erspart.

“Das ist der Mensch!” In diese Mahnung und Warnung an die Leute, die mit ihrer Vernunft das Schicksal, die Götter meistern zu können glauben, klingt die Oidipustragödie aus (1524 ff.). Aber so sehr wir den Dichter verstehen können, wenn er der Ueberhebung der Aufklärung entgegentrat, so muss doch andererseits zugestanden werden, dass er keinen Sinn für das Berechtigte jener grossen Beweg-

¹ Diels, Vorsokrat.², S. 590 No. 6; Ant. fr. 49-51; Buresch, Consol. hist. crit. in Leipziger Studien IX. 72 ff.; E. Jakoby, De Antiphontis sophistae libro (1908), p. 29 ss.

² G. Altwegg, De Antiphonte qui dicitur sophista (1908), p. 60 ss. sucht Benützung des Antiphon in Euripides “Alkestis,” also 438, nachzuweisen. Jakoby a. a. O., S. 35 setzt die Schrift “etwa in den Anfang des Peloponnesischen Kriegs.” Joël, Sokr. II. 640, 2 schliesst auch daraus, dass Antiphon bei Platon nie vorkommt, dass er im letzten Jahrzehnt des 5. Jahrhunderts nicht mehr lebte. Eine bestimmte Ueberlieferung fehlt.

ung hatte und dass er mit seiner einseitigen und engherzigen Apologie des Volksglaubens der religiös konservativen Partei Vorspann leistete, die mit dem Gesetz des selbst von Aristophanes verspotteten Orakelpriesters Diopeithes gegen die Astronomen,¹ zum Angriff gegen die Vertreter der Aufklärung vorging und damit die rechtliche Grundlage für die Asebieprozesse gegen Aspasia und Anaxagoras, Protagoras und Diagoras und schliesslich gegen Sokrates geschaffen hat.

Im Vergleich zu den bisher besprochenen Stücken treten in den "Trachinierinnen" und der "Elektra" die Anspielungen auf die Aufklärungsbewegung sehr zurück. In dem ersteren Drama kann man es als eine unter dem Einfluss des Euripides² gemachte Konzession an die neue Weltanschauung betrachten, dass die Liebesleidenschaft des Herakles pathologisch als Krankheit (*νόσος* 445) dargestellt wird. Aufgebracht hat diese von den beiden Dichtern in die Tragödie eingeführte psychopathische Auffassung der Liebe wahrscheinlich *Gorgias*, der in seiner "Helena" (19) darüber sagt: *εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπινον νόσημα καὶ ψυχῆς ἀγνότημα, οὐχ ὡς ἀμάρτημα μεμπτέον ἀλλ' ὡς ἀτύχημα νομιστέον*.³

In der "Elektra," die jedenfalls dem gleichnamigen Stück des Euripides vorangiegt,⁴ ist der starke formale Einfluss der sophistischen Rhetorik nicht zu verkennen, z.B. in dem Dialog zwischen Klytaimnestra und Elektra (516 ff.).⁵ Sachlich ist zu beachten das entscheidende Eintreten für den Unsterblichkeitsglauben (244 ff.), der hier als ein ebenso unentbehrlicher Bestandteil der Religion erscheint wie im "Oidipus" die Mantik und ohne den *ἔρροι τ' ἂν αἰδῶς ἀπάντων τ' εὐσέβεια θνατῶν* (249 f.); ferner der Versuch, sogar die sittliche Berechtigung der Blutrache zu erweisen (951 ff. 1093 ff.), und die Art, wie die Opferung der Iphigenie als durchaus einwandfrei

¹Plut. Per. 32; Aristoph. Wesp. 380; Vögel 988; A. Schöll, Soph., S. 191 will in Oid. Tyr. 883 ff. geradezu eine Anspielung auf die gegen die Umgebung des Perikles angestrengten Prozesse sehen.

²S. meinen Euripides, S. 225 ff.

³Die Blasphemie des Hyllos (Trach. 1264-74) lasse ich ausser Betracht, da sie keinesfalls die Meinung des Dichters wiedergibt. (Schol. zu El. 831: *τελέως ἀμνηστέον ὁ Σοφοκλῆς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς βλασφημεῖν*.) und ausserdem begründeter Verdacht einer Trübung der Ueberlieferung vorliegt. Cf. Rohde, Psyche² II. 238, 2.

⁴H. Steiger, Warum schrieb Euripides seine Elektra? Philologus LVI (1897), S. 561 ff.

⁵O. Navarre, Essai sur la rhétorique Grecque avant Aristote (1900), p. 74 s.

hingestellt wird: alles unverkennbar in beabsichtigtem Gegensatz zu den kritischen Bedenken der neuen u.a. von Euripides vertretenen Anschauung.¹ Nichts anderes als ein Protest gegen die sophistische Eristik eines *Protagoras* und anderer ist es auch, wenn Sophokles die Gerechtigkeit dem Streit der Meinungen entrückt wissen will (466 f.), während er in seiner Forderung strengster Bestrafung der Verbrecher zum Zweck der Abschreckung (1505 ff.) sich wieder mit den Abderiten *Protagoras* und *Demokrit* berührt, was um so beachtenswerter ist, als diese Abschreckungstheorie dem ganz der Vergeltungsidee gewidmeten Stücke (1495 f.) recht unorganisch angehängt ist (1507).² Endlich ist eigentümlich die dem *Orestes* in den Mund gelegte Reflexion über die Not- oder Gewinnlüge (61 ff.), deren Berechtigung mit einem Beispiel aus *Herodot* (IV. 95 f.) belegt wird. Ihre Verteidigung kehrt bei *Sophokles* noch mehrfach wieder³ und auch *Herodot* lässt in ganz unpassender Weise den Avestabekenner *Dareios* dafür eintreten (III. 72). In Sophistenkreisen aber war die *δικαία ἀπάτη* ein viel behandeltes Problem und *Gorgias* scheint sie in ethischer wie in ästhetischer Hinsicht erörtert zu haben.⁴

Der im Jahr 409 aufgeführte "*Philoktetes*" atmet in seiner ganzen Anlage wieder eine grundsätzliche Polemik gegen die Sophistik und zwar nach der ethischen Seite hin. Die selbstsüchtige *Uebersenschenmoral*, die *Platon* den *Kallikles* im "*Gorgias*" und den *Thrasymachos* im "*Staat*" (I. 338 C *εἶναι τὸ δίκαιον οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ τὸ τοῦ κρείττονος συμφέρον*) verkünden lässt und die ebenso rückhaltlos "die Athener" bei *Thukydides* (V. 85 ff.) gegenüber den unglücklichen *Meliern* proklamieren, wird in der Person des *Odysseus*, der hier ein ganz anderer ist als derselbe Held im "*Ajas*" dargestellt und bekämpft. In dem aufrichtigen und gerecht gesinnten *Neoptolemos* stellt ihm *Sophokles* ein ethisches Idealbild nach seinem Sinn gegenüber und der greise Dichter lässt den Wunsch durchblicken, das

¹Vgl. die Gegenbeispiele: Eur. Mel. desm. fr. 532 (Vernichtung im Tod); El. 974. Or. 508 ff. (Blutrache); Iph. Taur. 380 ff. 463 ff., wozu Ed. Meyer, Forschungen zur alten Geschichte II. 263, 1.

²Schol. zu El. 466: οὐκ ἔχει λόγον τὸ φιλονεκεῖν περὶ τοῦ δικαίου, wozu vgl. Protag. bei Diog. L. 9, 51; Straftheorie: Plat. Prot. 322 D, 324 B, 325 A; Demokrit fr. 257-60.

³Kreusa fr. 326; Aith. fr. 25; fr. inc. 749. 750.

⁴Gorg. Hel. 10 f.; fr. 23 (Diels); Dial. 3, 10; Xen. Mem. IV. 2, 14 ff.; Hippokr. De Diaeta 1, 24.

junge von den Sophisten erzogene Geschlecht möge sich nach kurzer Abirrung von der rechten Bahn auch wieder so auf sich selbst und auf eine gesunde Sittlichkeit besinnen wie der jugendliche und ritterliche Sohn des Achilleus. Die extremste Richtung der Sophistik hat die *σοφία* überhaupt in Verruf gebracht. Darum dreht sich das Gespräch zwischen Odysseus und Neoptolemos (1222 ff.) geradezu um die *Frage nach dem richtigen Begriff der σοφία*. Darnach ist die Weisheit des Ithakesiers eine falsche Weisheit, weil sie um des Vorteils willen auch vor Lüge und Unrecht nicht zurückscheut und ein Verfahren befolgt, bei dem man alle Scham (*αἰσχύνη* 120) verleugnen muss und das selbst die Götter für seine frivolen Zwecke missbraucht (992). In keinem seiner Stücke gebraucht Sophokles so oft wie hier das Wort 'σοφός' und seine Ableitungen, aber mit einer einzigen Ausnahme (423 von Nestor) immer in ungünstigem Sinne.¹ In unzweideutiger Weise wird auch der *verhängnisvolle Einfluss der neumodischen Rhetorik auf das öffentliche Leben* gerügt, was schon den Alten nicht entgieng.² In die Mahnung, die Frömmigkeit immer, selbst im Kriege, hochzuhalten (1441), klingt auch dieses Stück aus.

Wie der "Philoktetes" so bekämpfen auch zahlreiche *Bruchstücke* verlorener Dramen die *sophistische Rhetorik*, in deren Pflege der Dichter nicht nur ein bedenkliches Ueberwiegen formaler Kunst über die Wahrheit und Sachlichkeit des Inhalts der Rede sondern namentlich auch eine Gefahr für die Tatkraft sieht, der nach seiner Ansicht das viele Reden Eintrag tut. Manchmal ist der Träger der neuen geschwätzigen Rhetorik wieder Odysseus: so in dem an Stelle eines Satyrdramas aufgeführten *Σύνδειπνον* (fr. 142) und in der, wie neue Funde gelehrt haben, hievon zu unterscheidenden Tragödie 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογοι,' in der (v. 19 ff.) Achilleus zu Odysseus die Worte sprach:

Ἀεῖ ποτ' ἐστὲ νωχελῆς καὶ μέλλετε
 ῥήσεις θ' ἑκάστος μυρίας καθήμενος
 Λέγει, τὸ δ' ἔργον οὐδαμοῦ πορεύεται.³

¹ σοφός, σόφισμα, σοφίζεσθαι 14. 77. 119. 431 f. 440. 1015. 1244 ff. Vgl. den Chor. in Eur. Bacch. 395.

² Schol. zu Phil. 99: διαβάλλει τοὺς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ῥήτορας. 386 ff. 1306 f.

³ Berliner Klassikertexte V. 2, S. 64 ff. Vgl. noch fr. 827 (Odysseus); Alead. fr. 79. 82. 83. 85; Aletes fr. 98, 99; Eriph. fr. 192; Phaidr. fr. 622; Phryg. fr. 657, 2; fr. inc. 696. 734. Auch Sophokles Freund Ion von Chios (fr. 63 Nauck²) sagt: οὐ γὰρ λόγοις Λάκαινα πυργούται πόλις.

Aber nicht nur Tadel sondern Hass und Verachtung glaubt man hier und da aus des Dichters Worten herauszuhören: 'Δεινὸν τὸ τᾶς Πειθοῦς πρόσωπον' heisst es einmal (fr. 781). Ja er geht soweit, den Sophisten den Vorwurf weibischer Schwächlichkeit und Unsittlichkeit ins Gesicht zu schleudern (οἱ γὰρ γύνανδροι καὶ λέγειν ἡσκηκότες fr. 878),¹ was zugleich die Erwiderung auf den von den Vertretern der modernen Herrenmoral gegen die Anhänger der alten Religion und Sitte erhobenen Tadel der 'ἀνανδρία' sein mochte.² Sophokles ist, wenigstens für uns, der früheste Schriftsteller der das Wort 'σοφιστής' in ungünstigem Sinn gebraucht und es geradezu in einen Gegensatz zu natürlichem und unverdorbenem Denken und Empfinden bringt (Aletes fr. 97):

Ψυχὴ γὰρ εἵνους καὶ φρονούσα τοῦνδικον
Κρείσσων σοφιστοῦ παντός ἐστιν εὐρετής.

In seinem letzten Stücke, dem "Oidipus in Kolonos" hat Sophokles dem Kreon, der hier fast noch mehr als in der "Antigone" als brutaler Gewaltherrscher auftritt, Züge der Sophistik, wie er sie sah, geliehen: er sucht seine ungerechte und gewaltsame Handlungsweise durch gewandte und heuschlerische Reden zu beschönigen.³ Als positives Ideal hat ihm der Dichter den athenischen König Theseus gegenübergestellt, der nicht mit Worten sondern mit Taten dem Leben Glanz verleihen (1143 f.), dem Rechte dienen und das Unrecht vereiteln will (913 ff.). Und Oidipus? Der Unglücksmann, dessen Geschick noch einmal den greisen Dichter im Innersten bewegt hat und über den er, wie er mit Recht empfand, in der früheren Tragödie noch nicht das letzte Wort gesprochen hatte—Oidipus ist zwar keineswegs der friedevolle Greis, als den man ihn oft fälschlich hingestellt hat; aber eine grosse Veränderung ist doch mit ihm vorgegangen: im Gegensatz zu der wilden Selbstanklage am Schluss des ersten Stückes (1369 ff.) hat er jetzt das Bewusstsein seiner Unschuld wiedergefunden (Oid. Kol. 270 ff.) und weiss, dass er dem Lande, wo sein Leben enden soll, Segen bringen werde (287 f.). Sophokles ist zu der religiösen Erkenntnis gelangt: ist der Mensch wirklich nur ein Spielball in der Hand der Götter, so kann er auch nicht schuldig sein

¹ Aehnlich auch Aristoph. Ekkl. 112 f. Bei Xen. Mem. I 6, 13 werden die σοφισταί mit den πόρνοι verglichen; Gerhard, Phoinix von Kolophon (1909), S. 147 f.

² Die Stellen gesammelt in meinem Euripides, S. 487, 112.

³ Oid. Kol. 794, 806 f. 818 ff. 1000 f.

und muss ihm zuletzt die göttliche Gnade zuteil werden. Und die Menschen geleiten den schuldlosen Frevler wohl mit Grauen, aber nicht mit Hass sondern mit Mitleid an das Ziel seines Lebens.¹ So findet der Dichter auf dem Boden seiner Religion eine versöhnende Lösung für das Rätsel der Sphinx, das Problem des Menschen-schicksals.

Er hat diese Lösung gefunden ohne die Hilfe der Philosophie oder Sophistik, in deren Ablehnung er sich bis zuletzt treu bleibt. Aber er musste auch erkennen, dass es ihm nicht gelungen war, die mächtige Bewegung der Aufklärung in ihrem Siegeslauf zu hemmen und das Rad der Zeit rückwärts zu drehen. Daher ist über seine letzte Tragödie doch der Hauch einer resignierten Stimmung ausgegossen und der Seele des frommen und dabei bis ins hohe Alter lebensfrohen Dichters entringt sich doch hier am Ende seiner Laufbahn der schmerzvolle Seufzer (1224 ff.):

Μὴ φῦναι τὸν ἅπαντα νικᾷ λόγον · τὸ δ' ἐπεὶ φανῇ.
βῆναι κείθεν ὅθεν περ ἦκει
Πολὺν δεύτερον ὥς τάχιστα.—

In der Geschichte der Sophistik nimmt Sophokles, obwohl sogar er sich ihrem formalen, und in Nebendingen auch ihrem sachlichen, Einfluss nicht entziehen konnte, die Stellung eines charaktervollen Gegners ein und seine Dichtungen sind als Äußerungen eines solchen auch für die Erkenntnis ihrer Entwicklung von Wichtigkeit. Dass er seinem Glauben treu geblieben ist, wird ihm kein Verständiger verübeln; aber es darf auch nicht übersehen werden, dass er in seiner religiösen Einseitigkeit die Bedeutung der positiven Religion bis zu einem religiösen Absolutismus überspannt und den Wert und die Notwendigkeit freien philosophischen Denkens verkannt hat. Der Philosophie, in deren Dienst sich sein jüngerer Rivale Euripides stellte, gehörte die Zukunft. Ihm aber gab sein Volk, mit dessen religiösem, sittlichem und politischem Empfinden er sich eins fühlte, das Höchste, was es ihm zu geben vermochte, indem es ihn, der sich des Besuchs des von ihm besonders verehrten Gottes Asklepios gewürdigt geglaubt hatte, nach seinem Tode selbst zum Gegenstand religiöser Huldigung machte und ihn an der Seite des Gottes als Heros Dexion² verehrte.

¹ Christopf Schrempf, Menschenloos (1900), S. 35 ff.

² Etym. Magn. 256, 7 ff.; Rohde Psyche³ I 176, 6.

THE *VERSUS INCONDITI* OF PAP. OXYRHYNCH. 219

BY HENRY W. PRESCOTT

In the second volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (p. 39) Grenfell and Hunt published a "fragment from the end of a lament, apparently for the loss of a fighting-cock." The intelligible part of this fragment (vss. 13-24) I print below, with a critical apparatus. For convenience in the later discussion I have indicated the quantities of the syllables, admitting hiatuses wherever they are possible, and not attempting to mitigate the hiatus by crasis or semi-elision or total elision; this seems to be in accord with the intention of the author of the lament.

- 13 [. π]αῖδος ἔ[φ]υλασσειν ὃ φίλος μου Τρυφῶν
- 14 [. τε]κνὸν τῆρων ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις.
- 15 [ἄπορο]υμαὶ ποῦ βαδίσω. ἦ νᾶς μου ἐράγῃ.
- 16 [τὸν κ]ᾶ[τ]ᾶ[θ]υμίον ἀπολέσας ὄρνιν μου κλαῖω.
- 17 [. . . φ]ερε τὸ ὄρνιθοτροφὴν αὐτοῦ περὶ λαβῶ
- 18 τοῦ μ[ᾶχ]ιμοῦ τοῦ ἐπεραστοῦ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ.
- 19 χαρ[ῖν τ]οῦτοῦ ἐκαλονμην μέγας ἐν τῷ<ι> βίῳ
- 20 καὶ [ἐλ]εγόμεν μακάρι[ο]ς {ανδρες} ἐν τοῖς φίλοτρόφοις.
- 21 ψυχὸμαχῶ. ὃ γὰρ ἄ[λ]εκτὼρ ἡστοχῆκε μου
- 22 καὶ θακαθαλπᾶδος ἐρασθεῖς ἔμην ἐγκατέλιπε.
- 23 ἀλλ ἐπιθεῖς λίθον ἑμαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν
- 24 καθ[ῆ] συχᾶσσομαι. ὑμε[ι]ς δ ὑγιαίνετε φίλοι.

CRITICAL NOTES

The use of brackets corresponds to that of Grenfell and Hunt (cf. Vol. II, p. xi).

13. Τρνφων] cf. A. P. IX. 544. 1 (Crusius).

15. εραγη = ερραγη (G. H.).

16. ορνιν] ορνιθα Pap. ("ὄρνιν rhythmus suadet" Crusius). Perhaps ορνιθα. κλαιω] κλαιωι Pap. κλαῖω; cf. Crönert *Archiv für Papyrusforsch.* I (1901), 519, n. 2.

17. ορνιθοτροφην] ερνι[ν] τροφην Pap. (G. H.); ερκιον, τροφην Pap. (Crusius); ορνιθοτροφιν Wilamowitz *GGA.* (1900), 51; -ιν <-ιον (Dieterich *Untersuch. zur Gesch. d. gr. Spr.* 63-67), but -ίν does not develop from -εῖον (Dieterich *op. cit.* 66), so that Wilamowitz' reading is impossible. ὀρνιθοτροφῆν = ὀρνιθοτροφέων ("coop"); cf. ἐγμαγῆν, Ἰστῆν, μελανθῆν, Σαραπίην (-ῆν = -εῖον) in the papyri as quoted in Mayser *Gram. d. gr. Papyri*, pp. 77, 78, and for ὀρνιθοτροφέων cf. Harpocration s. v. οἰκίσκῳ. περιλαβῶ] περιλαβῶι Pap.

20. {ανδρες} I have removed from the text. ανδρες Pap. ("ε in ανδρες is strangely formed and may be intended for ο." G. H.); ανδρος = "der metaplastische Nominativ," Wilamowitz (*op. cit.*) suggests, "nach Analogie der darauf ausgehenden Eigennamen." ανδράσιν τοῖς Crusius. φιλοτροφοῖς Ludwig (*BPW.* [1900], 358, n. 1); φιλοτροφι Pap. ("There is a hole in the papyrus above the final ι . . . where the ο would have been, if it was written; i. φιλοτροφι[ο(ις)." G. H.).

21. ψυχομαχω] ψυχομαχῶι Pap.

22. θακαθαλπαδος] θάκα for τάχα Blass; θακα Θαλπαδος (-αδος?) Wilamowitz; Θακαθαλπάδος Bechtel (*Hermes* 35 [1900], 348); cf. Herondas VII, 48; similarly Platt *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900), 19; Ταχυθαλπάδος ("quick-incubator"), Postgate *Class. Rev.* XIII (1899), 441; the proper name in each case is supposed to be that of a hen. εμεν]: cf. Dieterich *Untersuch. zur Gesch. d. gr. Spr.* 190 (G. H.).

23. εματων]: cf. Mayser *op. cit.*, p. 115.

Before taking up the question that chiefly concerns me, two matters of general interest that seem to have escaped notice may be briefly considered. This fragment of papyrus "was found with a number of documents dating from the earlier part of the [first] century (e. g., cclix, cclxxxv)." This statement of Grenfell and Hunt is rather vague; it seems not to have occurred to them that the name Τρύφων in 13 is a name that appears with remarkable frequency in the documents, mostly of an official nature, which they publish in this same volume (Nos. 235, 264, 267, 269, 273, 275, 276, 282, 288, 304, 306, 308, 310, 315, 316, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 324). In fact, from these documents Grenfell and Hunt have constructed a partial biography of Tryphon, the weaver (pp. 244 ff.). If our fragment was found with any of these documents, we should be interested to know it; for it becomes at once possible that we are scrutinizing the work of a local amateur, and not a "literary" papyrus. The obvious crudities in respect of hiatus, the "rohes Gemisch von Prosa und Dichtung, von Worten und Formen des gemeinen Lebens" (Crönert *Archiv für Papyrusforsch.* I [1901], 518), the "schnurrige Expektoration, das Sekundanerpathos eines halbgebildeten Bengels, der mit dem Weltschmerz spielt, . . ." (Wilamowitz *GGA.* [1900], 50) are immediately understood if a friend of Tryphon, the weaver, is the author of this lament, and the experiences and the emotions an autobiographical record.

Another bit of external evidence points to a provincial origin: for it is of Egyptian customs that Diodorus is speaking in the following passage (i. 74), pertinent to the interpretation of φιλοτρόφοι (20):

. . . . καὶ τὸ θαυμασιώτατον, διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς εἰς ταῦτα σπουδῆς οἱ τε ὀρνιθοτρόφοι καὶ οἱ χηνοβοσκοὶ χωρὶς τῆς παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ἐκ φύσεως συντελουμένης γενέσεως τῶν εἰρημένων ζώων αὐτοὶ διὰ τῆς ἰδίας φιλοτεχνίας ἀνύθγον πλῆθος ὀρνέων ἀθροίζουσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιάζουσι διὰ τῶν ὀρνίθων, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ παραδόξως χειρουργοῦντες τῇ συνέσει καὶ φιλοτεχνίᾳ τῆς φυσικῆς ἐνεργείας οὐκ ἀπολείπονται.

The internal evidence certainly harmonizes with a theory that the composition is the work of a person who has little proficiency

in the technique of narration and description. His flowery language is in striking contrast to the rudeness of his sentence-structure: for the asyndeton may hardly be ascribed altogether to the emotional excitement of the sufferer. The figure in 15 is as discordant as the hiatuses in the same line. The poetry of ἀλιδρόσοις (in the unintelligible portion of the fragment which I have not printed) is at odds with the bald prose of ἐκαλούμην μέγας καὶ [ἐλ]εγόμεν μακάριος (19-20). The composition of a local amateur, not much above the social and intellectual level of his friend Tryphon, might naturally betray such crudities.

Grenfell and Hunt themselves suggest that the date of composition is not much earlier than that of the papyrus. They tell us that it is written in "a rough and rather difficult cursive hand of the earlier part of the first century." Of immediate interest are the following statements in their description:

Perhaps an attempt will be made to reduce the present composition to a metrical scheme, as has been effected by some critics in the case of the "Erotic Fragment." It is noticeable that the ends of the lines, so far as they are preserved, correspond with pauses in the sense, and that they are accordingly not quite uniform in length; and that in each line the penultimate syllable is, or may be, short.

Wilamowitz (*GGA.* [1900], 50-51) declines to find verses in the fragment: "ich weiss dass Verse den Hiat vermeiden, . . . ; es giebt sich als einen Brief: warum sollen wir es nicht dafür halten?" It is a letter in prose addressed to the brethren of the speaker, members of a fraternity of ὀρνιθοτρόφοι. But is there any evidence of a letter aside from ὑμεῖς δ' ὑγιαίνετε φίλοι (24)? And if the conclusion of a prologue of one of Plautus' comedies with its conventional *valete* were discovered under circumstances similar to those attending the discovery of our fragment, the suggestion that it was a fragment of a letter would not stand the test of time. Such a *valete* might appear in an environment not wholly free from hiatuses. Hiatuses may prevent lines from being poetry of a high order, but they certainly do not militate against the same lines being verses, at least from the composer's standpoint, especially if he be a friend and contemporary of

Tryphon, a weaver in Egypt in the first century A. D. One may hardly deny that the following are verses:

μή μου παρέλθης τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, ὁδοιπόρε,
 ἀλλὰ σταθεὶς ἄκουε καὶ μαθὼν ἅπι·
 οὐκ ἔστι ἐν Ἄδου πλοῖον, οὐ πορθμεὺς Χάρων,
 οὐκ Αἴακος κλειδοῦχος, οὐχὶ Κέρβερος κύων·
 5 ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες οἱ κάτω τεθνηκότες
 ὅστέα, τέφρα γεγόναμεν ἄλλο δὲ οὐδὲ ἔν.
 εἴρηκα σοι ὀρθῶς· ὕπαγε, ὁδοιπόρε,
 μή καὶ τεθνακῶς ἀδ[ό]λεσχός σοι φανῶ.

(Kaibel *Epig. Gr.* 646.)

To be sure, the hiatuses here are to some degree apparent, not real: οὐδὲ ἔν is not genuine hiatus, ἐπίγραμμα ὁδοιπόρε is perhaps only a case of elision that the stonecutter did not indicate. But can there be any doubt that the composer meant vs. 7 to represent the metrical scheme: --|v--|--|vvv|v--|v--? Such epigrams, of course, are often only crude expansions, unintelligent modifications, of archetypes; so here the archetype of vss. 3-4 is suggested by Callimachus *Epigr.* xiii (Wil.), and the hypermetrical κύων (4) is an unintelligent addition to the type-form. But this does not warrant us in denying that the author considered the seventh line of the epigram an iambic trimeter in spite of the hiatuses. The hiatuses in this inscription may be due to Roman influence—for the inscription is on a Roman tombstone and not earlier than the third century A. D.; but perhaps the author of our own fragment was exposed to the same influence.

It is evident that the editors of the papyrus, and Wilamowitz, are waiting for others to rush in where they fear to tread.¹ I should be reluctant to take the fatal step if Crusius (*Herondae Mimambi*⁴, ed. minor, p. 123) had not declared that this lament is written in choriambo-cretic verse, with an admixture of bac-

¹ For completeness, I add the comment of Crönert (*Archiv für Papyrusforsch.* I [1901], 518): "Die Worte sollen Versen darstellen, ein Paar Trimeter [he quotes 18-19], in denen aber weder Länge und Kürze noch auch Silbenzählung beobachtet wurde, auch ist der Hiat nicht anstössig."

chiuses and ditrochees! I quote his description in full: "fragmenti oratio certis colis discripta et paene ἑμμετρος; exitus ad unum omnes cretici vel paenonici (adpersis baccheis [21] et ditrochaeis), tetrametri fere mensuram explentes; schema hoc:

$$\begin{array}{c} \cong \cong \cong | \cong \cong \cong | \cong \cong \cong | \cong \cong \cong | \\ \cong \cong \cong | \cong \cong \cong | \cong \cong \cong | \cong \cong \cong | \end{array}$$

ita vs. 13: xx-|vvv-|vvv-|vv-|, 15 vvv-|vvv-|vvv-|vv-|, 17 vvv-|vvv-|vvv-|vvv-|, 21 vvv-|vvv-|vvv-|vv-|. Hiatus et syllaba anceps in exitu versuum, post dimetrum prius (15. 20), pedem primum (21) et paenultimum (15; cf. 18 extr.), cetera crasi aphaeresi correptione (5. 24) procurantur." I have not the courage to attempt any refutation of this flexible metrical scheme. If I could prove that the author was a friend of Tryphon, the weaver, I should question his ability to conceive of or handle such a complicated bit of versification. As it is, it seems to me that such crudities of expression as are found in the fragment are somewhat out of keeping with choriambo-cretic verse. I should as soon expect a day-laborer to choose a triolet for his occasional verse as our author, with his hiatuses and grotesque discordances of style, to elect choriambo-cretics. I must leave the scheme of Crusius to some expert in the "new metric"; being only a reader of classical poetry I can simply set forth my own ideas of the structure with the faint hope that they may be worth considering.

I had not read over many lines of the fragment quantitatively (admitting the hiatuses) before I became conscious that the cadence was that of the senarii of Plautus' comedies. On writing out a metrical scheme in accordance with this feeling, I found that the lines readily conformed, with three exceptions—vss. 16, 17, 20. In vs. 16 ὀρνῖθᾶ refused to fit into a senarius; either the writer was guilty of a false quantity, ὀρνῖθᾶ (which might be applied in ὀρνιθοτροφῆν in vs. 17 without spoiling the senarius)—and this is not impossible—or else he or the copyist intended to write ὀρνυ. In vs. 17 my trouble was with the deciphering of the papyrus by others: Grenfell and Hunt found the reading very difficult (ερνιο[ν] τροφην); Crusius, apparently after inspect-

ing the papyrus himself, seemed confident of ἐρκίον, τροφήν—yet it was hardly conceivable that the coop (ἐρκίον) was called the cock's nourishment;¹ I allowed myself, therefore, a guess at the true reading, and conjectured ὀρνιθοτροφήν, which may well have eluded the editors and Crusius because ὀρνιθοτροφήν = ὀρνιθοτροφείον had not occurred to their minds though well authenticated by the examples in Mayser, quoted above in the critical notes. The difficulty in vs. 20 was insuperable; any reasonable emendation resulted in a hypermetrical verse, but the removal of the somewhat dubious ἀνδρες made the verse at once metrical; obviously this is heroic treatment, and I do not mean that the composer did not intend ἀνδρες (or ἀνδράσι, if Crusius is right) to stand in the verse; at best these are *versus inconditi* and not to be scrutinized too closely. If my understanding of the meter appeals to others, a better suggestion may be forthcoming.²

The metrical scheme that results is in general accord with the Latin senarii of comedy:

13	x x	— — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —
14	x x	x x	— —	— —	— —	— —
15	— — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —	— —
16	— — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —	— —
17	x — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —	— —
18	— — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —	— —
19	— —	— —	— — —	— — —	— —	— —
20	— —	— —	— — —	— —	— —	— —
21	— — —	— — —	— —	— —	— —	— —
22	— — —	— — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —
23	— —	— — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —
24	— —	— — —	— —	— — —	— —	— —

Not only do the quantities conform to the metrical scheme of the Latin senarius, but the general structure of the verses satis-

¹ The latest report from Grenfell and Hunt (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* IV, p. 261) is to this effect: "θ in place of ο is possible, but the first letter is more like ε than ο. The η of τροφήν is certain." If the first letter must be ε, we should probably look for some word referring to the cock's food, with which τροφήν might stand in apposition.

² The quantities in θακαθαλπάδος (22) are quite uncertain. It is not likely that Bechtel's Θακοθαλπάδος would fit into the verse; its long initial syllable would make the rest of the verse difficult to manage as a senarius. Perhaps θακα- is a case of shifting of aspirates, for τάχα- (cf. ἐνθαῦτα, κύθρα, etc., Mayser *op. cit.*, p. 184). Then we may have θάκα θαλπάδος, or Θακαθαλπάδος in the sense of Postgate's Ταχυνθαλπάδος. But even the quantity of the penultimate syllable is uncertain.

fies other reasonable tests. The iambus is regular in the sixth foot, and the spondee occurs in the fifth foot in two-thirds of the verses. The one iambus in the fifth foot (21) is part of a polysyllabic word; the monosyllabic ending of the same verse is an enclitic. The distribution of the short syllables of the dactyls and anapests corresponds in the main to the general practice of the comic writers in Greek and in Latin. The two short syllables do not belong to different words except in one case, π]αῖδος ἐφύλασσαν (13). This division, not favored in Plautus,¹ occurs twelve times in Menander, and, with one exception, in the first foot (cf. White *Class. Phil.* IV [1909], 147, 149). In one other case (21) the dactyl is divided among three words; this Menander does freely (White *op. cit.* 149 and n. 1). The dactyl several times is contained in one word: twice it forms the beginning of a polysyllable (21, 22), three times the end of a polysyllable (16, 22, 24), once the middle of a polysyllabic word (17); there is no case of a dactylic word. Menander has no cases of the dactyl forming the conclusion of a polysyllable (White *op. cit.* 147), and only one in the middle of the polysyllable; similarly Aristophanes. These cases then are against my theory, but may be condoned in *versus inconditi*. Three of the four anapests form the beginning of polysyllables (15, 18, 19), one is an anapestic word (15): this accords with Menander's practice (White *op. cit.* 150). Two of the four tribrachs form the beginning of polysyllables (16, 20), one the middle of a polysyllable (24), one is divided among three words (13); this, again, corresponds to the treatment in Menander and Aristophanes (White *op. cit.* 142). The relation of dactyls to anapests is, of course, quite the opposite of the conditions in Menander's verse (White *op. cit.* 141); Menander favors the anapest; our author has five times as many dactyls as anapests; but in this regard Menander is not a fair standard of comparison, for he does not treat the even feet with the freedom available in the Latin senarius. I have no figures²

¹For similar imperfections in the *carmina epigraphica* cf. Hodgman, "The Versification of Latin Metrical Inscriptions," *Harv. Stud.* IX (1898), 138 ff.

²Except the statistics in Fay's *Mostellaria*, p. xvi, which show that the dactyls outnumber the anapests save in the first and fifth feet. It is clear that the number of

at hand for comparison with the Latin senarius, and must refer the reader to his own knowledge of the verses of Terence and Plautus.

But the reader may perhaps object to the frequency of the resolved feet, both in individual lines and in the fragment as a whole. It may be true that few passages of twelve consecutive verses in Plautus will show so many resolutions in separate verses. Isolated verses so freely handled are easily found: *Mercator* 247 (dactyls in first, second, fourth feet), 260 (dactyls in first, second, fourth, fifth feet), 314 (dactyls in first and third feet, tribrach in second, anapest in fifth), 330, 547, 565, 568, 576, 581, 681, 685, 709, etc. A passage like that of the *Mercator* 681 ff. is not essentially different in the kind and the number of resolutions from our verses:

disperii, perii misera, vae miserae mihi!
 # satin tu sana's, opsecro? quid eiulas?
 # Dorippa, mea Dorippa! # quid clamas, opsecro?¹
 # nescio quaest mulier intus hic in aedibus.
 # quid, mulier? # mulier meretrix. # veron serio?
 # nimium scis sapere ruri quae non manseris.

The succession of dactyls in individual verses (21, 22, 23, 24) has a parallel in such a verse as *Mercator* 260:

atque ego illi aspicio forma eximia mulierem.

The frequency of such resolutions in our papyrus may be due partly to the emotional condition of the speaker (similarly in *Merc.* 681 ff.), partly to the fact that these are perhaps the verses of a poetaster, not of a poet. The inexperienced versifier betrays himself chiefly in the freedom with which he introduces resolutions.

The Roman playwrights are very careful to observe caesural pauses in the senarius, and the penthemimeral pause is distinctly

dactyls resulting from my metrical interpretation is a serious obstacle to my theory. But, although in Plautus I should hardly expect to find a succession of seventy-two feet of which twenty were dactyls, it is certainly not difficult to find twelve successive verses in Plautus in which the number of dactyls runs up to sixteen, especially if words of the type *meas* are subject to iambic shortening rather than synizesis.

¹ This verse is quite uncertain, and the scansion as yet undetermined.

favored. Aristophanes, on the contrary, has little regard for such pauses. We hardly know whether or not to look for the caesural pause in these *versus inconditi*. If it is to be looked for, it is found with suspicious regularity in the fourth, not in the third foot (except in 24), and once at the end of the third (15). But it may reasonably be doubted if the writer was conscious of these divisions. One cannot mitigate the hiatuses by using caesural pauses as a justification; only in 15, hardly in 23, possibly in 24, does the hiatus come before the caesural pause—if indeed there be such a pause. Nor do I see any necessity of attempting to mitigate the hiatuses by other means: several of them resist any efforts to soften them by crasis; should we not leave them all as they stand?

These lines are, therefore, to my mind, iambic senarii such as are familiar to us in Roman comedy. They are cruder in respect of hiatus and caesural pause and, possibly, resolved feet. They are very likely the *versus inconditi* of a poetaster, a friend of Tryphon, the weaver, living in Egypt in the first century A. D. Have they any further significance? As the product of a local amateur they should interest the student of metric, for they may be of significance in the history of the development of verse form. Such a detail as the identity of sentence and verse is not unimportant. But we know too little positively of the author to use the material before us. Was he a friend of Tryphon, the weaver? Was he a Roman, or in any way subject to Roman influence? If he was a Greek, removed from Roman influence, and if his verse is such verse as had been written in Greek by amateurs two or three centuries before his time, or even by artists of a type somewhat inferior to the writers of the New Comedy, these verses might be of great significance to a student of the comic senarii in Plautus and Terence. From the Erotic Fragment, known as "The Maid's Lament," we have learned to understand better the *cantica* of Plautus; if such verses as these in our papyrus, only perhaps less crude in respect of hiatus, but characterized by the free handling of the even feet, existed in Greek three centuries earlier than our fragment, we might have to revise our theory that the senarius of Latin comedy is a *Roman* adaptation of Menander's

trimeter. As yet, however, we have simply *versus inconditi* of a local poetaster of the first century A. D. who has allowed himself the freedom in the even feet of his senarii that we at present recognize to be the special feature that distinguishes the Latin verse from its Greek congener.¹

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

November 26, 1909

¹The unintelligible part of the fragment contains a few ends of verses that must be taken into account. Of these *καλλονην* (4), *αλεκτορα μου δυναμεθα* (9), *εκ περιπατου* (10) do not conflict with my metrical scheme. *εν τη[ι ο]δωι* (5) is quite uncertain. *και πολλα [..]ρων* (8) is also uncertain, but the suggestion *και πολλα [στε]ρων* would not necessarily interfere with my theory. The papyrus is said to be in the possession of Yale University.

THE OLYMPIC VICTORY OF AGIAS OF THESSALY

By KENDALL K. SMITH

Inscribed upon a long pedestal¹ at Delphi, beneath one of the nine cavities cut in the top to receive the plinths of statues, are these elegiac verses:

Πρῶτος Ὀλύμπια παγκράτιον, Φαρσάλιε, νίκας
Ἀγία Ἀκνονίων, γῆς ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίας,
πεντάκις ἐν Νεμέᾳ, τρὶς Πύθια, πεντάκις Ἴσθμοι·
καὶ σὼν οὐδεὶς πω στήσε τροπαῖα χερῶν.²

According to this inscription we have in Agias the first Thessalian to win the pancratium at Olympia. My object in this paper is to propose a date for that victory, the importance of which is not limited merely to the field of historical research but has also its bearing upon the history of Greek literature. For as long as the victory of Timodemus, the Athenian pancratiast, is left undated, so long will the dating of Pindar's second Nemean ode³ and its position among his works remain in doubt. Any narrowing of the field brings nearer the solution of that literary problem, and may ultimately decide the disputes of Fraccaroli, Schmidt, Christ, and others.⁴ Since Agias was the first Thessalian to win the pancratium at Olympia, his victory must come before 408 B. C., for another Thessalian, Polydamas, won in that year.⁵ Therefore, he belongs in the fifth century at the latest. If the date proposed in this paper be accepted, Christ's dating of the second Nemean ode in the years 459-51 B. C. will have to be given up, and choice made between the extremes, either before 480 B. C., or after 448 B. C.⁶

¹ *Am. Jour. Arch.* XIII (1909), pp. 447 ff.

² *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), pp. 592, 593.

³ *Schol. Nem.* 2, 4: μετὰ γὰρ τὴν Νεμεακὴν νίκην ἐστεφανοῦτο τὰ Ὀλύμπια (*Boeckh Pindari Opera* II, Pt. 1, p. 436).

⁴ See C. Gaspar *Essai de chronologie Pindarique*, pp. 51-53.

⁵ *Paus.* 6, 5, 1 ff.; 7, 27, 6; H. Foerster *Die Sieger in den olympischen Spielen*, p. 21, no. 279.

⁶ The interval being covered by the Oxyrhynchus papyrus published by C. Robert, *Hermes* XXXV (1900), pp. 141-95.

[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY V, April, 1910] 169

Shortly after the discovery of the inscription, Homolle¹ proposed the date 428 B. C., for the *floruit* of Agias, but did not suggest any date for his Olympic victory. Preuner,² in accepting the dating of Daochus, the son, between 431 and 404 B. C., set the victory of Agias before the middle of the fifth century. He had no means of arriving at a more exact date, since the Oxyrhynchus papyrus,³ which gives the names of victors at Olympia between 480 and 448 B. C., was not then published. This papyrus appeared so soon after his work that its publisher, C. Robert, could not avail himself of Preuner's hints, or may have overlooked Agias altogether, since no mention is made of him. No one, so far as I know, has yet brought the inscription at Delphi into connection with the Oxyrhynchus papyrus, either to fill the lacunae or to supplement it in the years beyond the point where it stops.

With Robert's restorations the papyrus contains only one lacuna in the list of pancratiast victors. This is the year 460 B. C. The following Olympic years through 448 B. C. are filled. Between 448 and 408 B. C., the year of the victory of Polydamas, there remain unfilled the dates 444, 440, 436, and either 416 or 412 B. C.⁴

The choice among these dates depends almost entirely on the date of Daochus, the son of Agias. If, as Homolle,⁵ Preuner,⁶ Kent,⁷ and Meyer⁸ agree, this Daochus was ἀρχων of all Thessaly during, or not later than, the period 431–404 B. C., it seems more reasonable to date his father's victory in 460 B. C., i. e., thirty years before, than in even the earliest of the next possible dates, 444 B. C., only thirteen years before. For, the latter date requires us to assume either that Daochus became ἀρχων when still a boy, or, supposing him to have been

¹ *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), pp. 595, 596.

² E. Preuner *Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk*, p. 17.

³ *Hermes* XXXV (1900), pp. 141–95.

⁴ The victors in the other years are:

432 B. C.	} Dorieus of Rhodes (Foerster, Nos. 258, 260, 262).
428	
424	
420	
Androsthenes (Foerster, No. 267).	
416 or 412 Androsthenes, 2d victory (Foerster, No. 272).	

—H. Foerster, *Die Sieger in den olympischen Spielen*, pp. 19, 20.

⁵ *Bull. Cor. Hell.*, loc. cit.

⁶ Preuner *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁷ R. G. Kent *A History of Thessaly from the Earliest Historical Times to the Accession of Philip V of Macedonia*, pp. 9–10, 18, 19.

Cf. E. Meyer *Theopomps Hellenika*, pp. 247 ff. He gives as dates ca. 445–415 B. C.

no more than twenty at that time, that Agias, his father, had been married some eight years and was about thirty-eight years old when he won his victory. Then, as we raise the son's age, the father's increases as well. However nominal this office of ἀρχων may have been, an age of thirty seems none too young at which to take it up. If, indeed, he was thirty in 431 B. C., his father must have been married in 462 B. C. (or earlier, since we cannot say that Daochus was the oldest son. He is certainly not named for his grandfather). And if Agias married in 462 B. C., even supposing him to have been only twenty-two, then a victory in 444 B. C., eighteen years later, would bring him into his fortieth year. For these reasons, the placing of the rule of Daochus between 431 and 404 B. C. seems bound to carry his father's victory back before 444 B. C., hence to 460 B. C.

The authority for this extraordinarily long rule of twenty-seven years, unrecorded elsewhere in history, comes from an inscription¹ on the same long pedestal at Delphi on which Agias is commemorated. The details given of a rule over all Thessaly "not by force but legally," together with what is otherwise known about Thessalian affairs, suggest that this was an elective office with few real powers. Now, after Lycophron's victory in 404 B. C.,² there was no peaceful stretch of twenty-seven years in Thessalian history until the days of Macedonian dominion. In 431 B. C.,³ Thessalian contingents came to Athens not from any central government but by cities. Into the intervening period the rule of Daochus just fits.

One slight fact points to the location of supreme authority in the year 424 B. C. at Pharsalus, the home of Daochus.⁴ Brasidas in that year attempted to pass through Thessaly and sent a messenger to friends of his in Pharsalus, by whose help, or rather, by rapid marching, he succeeded in getting through the country.⁵ Thessaly during this period was a neutral, and the peace and plenty recorded in the inscription may reflect this attitude.

Bull. Cor. Hell. XXI (1897), p. 593:

Δόχος Ἀγία εἰμι, παρὶς Φάρσαλος, ἀπάσης
Θεσσαλίας ἀρχας οὐ βία ἀλλὰ νόμῳ
ἐπτά καὶ εἰκοσι ἔτη· πολλῇ δὲ καὶ ἀγλαοκάρπῳ
εἰρήνῃ πλούτῳ τε ἔβρυνε Θεσσαλία.

² *Xen. Hell.* 2, 3, 4.

³ *Thuc.* 2, 22, 3.

⁴ Brought forward by R. G. Kent *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 18, 19.

⁵ *Thuc.* 4, 78, 1.

The chief support, however, for this date must come from the dates of the son and grandson of Daochus, both of whom are commemorated by inscriptions on the family pedestal at Delphi.¹ Sisyphus,² the son, was a brave warrior; Daochus II, the grandson, was tetrarch of Thessaly and hieromnemon of the Amphictyons at the time when he dedicated this monument to his family.³ In the case of Daochus II it has been shown by Homolle⁴ and Preuner⁵ that he must have held these offices between 339 and 332 B. C., and that he was active politically as early as 352 B. C. If we take 338 B. C. as a working date and compute each generation at 33 years—the number found most workable by Kirchner in his *Prosopographia Attica*—the time between 404 and 338 B. C. is seen to cover exactly the required span of two generations, sixty-six years. In other words, the known date of the grandson harmonizes with the assumed final date of the grandfather.

By the same method of calculation we secure as the corresponding date in the life of Sisyphus 371 B. C. (338+33). Is it possible that this is the same Sisyphus mentioned in the history of Theopompus,⁶

¹ For reference a family tree is given here:

	Aparus	Flor. 518 B. C.
	Aconius	485 B. C.
Telemachus	Agias	452 B. C.
	Agelaus	452 B. C.
	Daochus I (431-404)	419 B. C.
	Sisyphus I	386 B. C.
	Daochus II (339-332)	353 B. C.
	Sisyphus II	320 B. C.

² *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), pp. 593, 594:

Οὐκ ἔψευσέ σε Παλλὰς ἐν ἑπνῷ, Δαόχου νιὲ
Σίσυφε, ἀ δ' εἶπε σαφῆ θῆκεν ὀποσχεσίαν
ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἔδυσ περὶ τεύχεα χρωτὶ,
οὐτ' ἔφυγες δηλοῖς οὐτε τι τραῦμα' ἔλαβες.

³ *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), p. 594:

Λέγων οἰκείων προγόνων ἀρετὰς τάδε δῶρα
στήσεμ Φοῖβω Ἀνακτι, γένος καὶ πατρίδα τιμῶν,
Δαόχος εὐδόξῳ χρώμενος εὐλογία,
τέτταρχος Θεσσαλῶν,
ιερομνήμων Ἀμφικτυόνων.

⁴ *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), p. 595.

⁵ Preuner *op. cit.*, pp. 7-12.

⁶ Theopomp. ap. Athen. 6, 252F.

and so necessarily active in or before 394 B. C., the year with which the history concludes? To have been a prominent figure in 394 B. C., or earlier, he must have been born not far from 425 B. C. Then in 371 B. C. he would have been about fifty-five years old. If, then, for purposes of computation, we consider that one generation or 33 years later (i. e., 338 B. C.), Daochus II was also fifty-five, he must have been fifty when appointed tetrarch and have worked in Philip's interest at the age of forty-one; none of which are unreasonable ages. Then, turning to Daochus I, if we assume that in 404 B. C. he also was fifty-five, we obtain the not improbable age of twenty-eight for his election(?) as ruler of Thessaly.¹

Or, if we apply the test of generations to the date of Agias himself, quite apart from the twenty-seven years of his son's rule, we obtain fresh support for the year 460 B. C. as opposed to 444 B. C. For, the calculation by intervals of thirty-three years gives to Agias the year 437 B. C., as the date toward the end of his career corresponding with the age fifty-five computed for his descendants. If, now, we consider him to have been fifty-five years old in 437 B. C., it is impossible that his great Olympic victory came in 444 B. C., when he would have been forty-eight years old. Even if we assume that there was a variation of ten years from the iron-clad succession of generations that we have been using, he remains thirty-eight at the time of his victory. On the other hand, the date 460 B. C. allows us to retain the full length of the generations and makes his age when he won, thirty-two.²

Thus the calculation by generations is not only in complete accord with the supposition that Agias' son was ruler of Thessaly in 431-404 B. C., which carries with it a preference for the date 460 B. C., but independently favors that date itself. The foundations of such an argument as this are admittedly weak. Hypothesis rests on hypothesis. But the resultant date is certainly reasonable. I have no doubt that the correct date is either 460 or 444 B. C. The facts at

¹ Indeed, if any change is desired, it would be towards adding to his age, therewith increasing the probability that the Sisyphus of 371 B. C. was the Sisyphus of 394 B. C.

² Whether his other victories—3 Pythian, 5 Nemean, 5 Isthmian—were grouped around, preceded, or came after his Olympic victory, we cannot say. They cover a period of at least nine years. But even if they all preceded it and it was the culmination of his athletic career, he can have won his first victory in 470 B. C., at the age of twenty-two.

present ascertainable seem to point rather to the former year. In this I have the support of Preuner, who looked for a date before the middle of the century. This can only be 460 B. C. If we place his victory in that year, we can fill the lacuna in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus and complete the list of winners in the pancratium between 480 and 448 B. C. Then the victory of Timodemus, which Robert wanted to place in 460 B. C.¹ and which must have come there to maintain Christ's dating of the second Nemean ode, will have to fall outside this period, and be dated either before 480 or after 448 B. C.

There is one uncomfortable doubt still left undecided. Did Telemachus, the brother of Agias, also win an Olympic victory? The inscription² on the pedestal states that on the same days he won the same number of crowns at wrestling as his brother did in the pancratium. If one of them was won at Olympia, we shall be obliged either to move to 464 B. C. (which is vacant) Amesinas of Cyrene, whose victory in wrestling is placed in 460 B. C. by Julius Africanus,³ or else transfer Agias to 444 B. C. The indefiniteness of the inscription, however, and its omission to speak of an Olympic victory by name, lead me to believe that while Telemachus may have won as many times as his brother, he did not win at Olympia, and that *ἡμασι τοῖς αὐτοῖς* cannot be pressed too literally. I have not allowed this point to enter into the argument because of its uncertainty. And if it is felt that the inscription does intend to attribute to him an Olympic victory in the same year with Agias, I should be inclined to question the accuracy of the dating of Amesinas rather than to remove Agias from 460 to 444 B. C.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

¹ *Hermes* XXXV (1900), p. 183.

² *Bull. Cor. Hell.* XXI (1897), p. 593:

Κἀγὼ τοῦδε ὁμᾶδελφο[s] ἔ]φην, ἀριθμὸν δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν
ἡμασι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐχφ[έρ]ομαι στεφάνων
νικῶν μονοπάλ[ης], Τ[υ]σσηνῶν δὲ ἀνδρᾶ κρᾶτιστον
κτεῖνα, ἐθέλοντο[s] εἶν· Τ]ηλέμαχος δ' ὄνομα.

³ Euseb. *Chron.* I, 203; H. Foerster *op. cit.*, p. 16, no. 225.

ON THE EIGHT-BOOK TRADITION OF PLINY'S LETTERS IN VERONA

BY ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

In the *Rheinisches Museum*, Vol. LVIII (1903), pp. 467-71, Professor Karl Lohmeyer published an account of certain quotations from Pliny's *Letters* given in a MS *florilegium* composed in the year 1329, probably in Verona, where it now reposes in the Capitular Library of the cathedral (No. CLXVIII). Professor Lohmeyer also discussed the knowledge of Pliny's *Letters* shown by Iohannes [de Matociis], *mansionarius* at Verona, who composed in the second decade of the same fourteenth century a voluminous *Historia Imperialis* (cf., *inter alia*, cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. CCIV), and at some time not far removed a biographical note on the two Plinies, commonly entitled *Brevis adnotatio de duobus Pliniis*, and not infrequently found appended, or prefixed, to MSS of the Natural History, or of the eight-book tradition of the *Letters* (cf., *inter alia*, in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, cod. Auct. F. ii. 22; cod. Laud. MS Lat. 52; cod. MS Linc. Coll. (e) Lat. 77: in the Cambridge University Library, cod. I. 347: in the British Museum, cod. Harl. 4868: in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, cod. 8622: in the Hofbibliothek at Vienna, cod. 48: in the Laurentian Library at Florence, cod. 47.34: in the Vatican Library, cod. Vat. lat. 5106; cod. Vat. lat. 3405; cod. Regin. 1472). Every Plinian scholar is also acquainted with the views of Remigio Sabbadini on the same subject, published in his *Scoperte*, and *Scuola di Guarino*, in the *Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica*, and elsewhere.

I may perhaps be allowed a few brief remarks on the same theme, prompted by some study of the text-tradition of Pliny's *Letters*, and by a recent visit to Verona, where, by the kindness of the librarian of the Capitular Library, Don Antonio Spagnolo, I was permitted to study and copy the excerpts in the *Flores moralium auctoritatum*, and to make other researches.

There seems to be no reason to doubt that the anonymous codex of the *Flores moralium auctoritatum maxime utilitatis et honoris*, as
[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY V, April, 1910] 175

it is called in the colophon, is an autograph, and that it was composed in the library where it is still preserved. The authors quoted in it appear all to have been represented at that time by MSS in the Capitular Library. But, as regards Pliny, at least, there is no inference to be drawn about the order of the letters in the MS used by the "florist" (if I may so term him); for the edifying apothegms from many sources are arranged by him in three books under a considerable number of chapter-headings, according to subject; and therefore the order of the citations from a given author could not be influenced by the order within his works, unless perhaps a number of quotations from the same author should appear in the same chapter. This last is not the case with the quotations from Plin. *Ep.* v. 9 and v. 20, cited by Lohmeyer as indicating that, in the MS of the *Letters* used by the florist, v. 9 stood after v. 20. These quotations in the *Flores* are in different chapters. Again, there has been no such correction of the book-number in the second (in the florist's order) of these quotations as Lohmeyer records. The numeral 6 stands perfectly clear and uncorrected. But, it may be remarked, the quotation from vi. 2. 8 is assigned to book 5 (the florist uses sometimes Arabic and sometimes Roman numerals), and two from iv. 16 to book v, along with one from v. 17. 3.

Nor can I agree with Lohmeyer that the fact that the last quotation from the *Letters* (not the last in the florist's order, however) is the smug apothegm that concludes book vii is any indication that the MS of the *Letters* from which the quotations were taken did not include book ix (of course numbered as viii—for there is no reason to doubt that here we have to do with an eight-book text). It is too great a strain upon the imagination of the historian of the text-tradition of Pliny's *Letters* to believe, in the lack of other evidence, that the MS of that work existing, doubtless, in 1329 and earlier, in the Capitular Library at Verona, and used there by the anonymous compiler of the *Flores moralium auctoritatum*, was any other than the MS used at about the same time by Iohannes, the Mansionarius, (doubtless in the same library) which clearly contained eight books. On the other hand, the florist appears to have been rather a dull fellow (he even blunders in the same way as the "Wicked" Bible, for he leaves out Pliny's negative in vi. 22. 8), and it is quite easily

conceivable that he stopped his (surely somewhat careless) excerpting of Pliny before he had finished the volume, or that, in his haste (he says apologetically in his colophon that the *flores* were *sub breui interuallo conditi*), he struck nothing in the eighth (really ninth) book that he thought worth quoting. The total number of quotations from Pliny in the *Flores* is not so great, after all. Nor can the confusion in order of the letters of book ix in the eight-book tradition be held to strengthen in any way, as Lohmeyer suggested, the notion that the ninth book had not yet been appended to the first seven. The fifth book also in the same tradition shows a different order of the letters from that found in the two other MS-families. And to postulate thus gratuitously yet another separate, and now utterly untraceable, source for the ninth book is altogether to violate logical probability. The easier explanation is surely here, as often, the more satisfactory.

Most, if not all, of recent utterances concerning Iohannes, the Veronese Mansionarius, appear to depend upon the conclusions reached by Girolamo Tartarotti, whose "letters" on that subject were reprinted at Venice, in 1754, in the volume entitled *Memorie antiche di Rovereto* (pp. 130 ff.). Tartarotti rightly concluded that the Mansionarius wrote his *Historia imperialis* (which has apparently never been printed) in the second decade of the fourteenth century; for in the earlier part of his book the author mentions the current year as 1313, and in the later part, as 1320 (*ab ipso Othone, qui coepit anno Domini DCCCCLXII usque in annum Domini praesentem MCCCXX computantur anni CCCLVII*). But Tartarotti further believed that the *Brevis adnotatio de duobus Pliniis* must have been composed at a later date than the *Historia*, merely because of an observed difference in the title by which Pliny the Younger is referred to in the two works.

I have been unable to find any real evidence concerning the precise date of composition of the *Brevis adnotatio*. All of the copies of it that I have been able to trace are of the fifteenth century. There is apparently no copy in the Capitular Library at Verona. Tartarotti knew only two copies in the Vatican Library, apparently two of the three that I have mentioned above. He was doubtless correct, as against Scipione Maffei, in identifying the author of each

of the two works as one and the same man, and as the Iohannes Mansionarius Veronensis mentioned by Panvinio and Pastrengo. The Mansionarius was known by Tartarotti to have been alive only as late as 1328 (*loc. cit.*, p. 155), but an early MS note in the copy of the *Memorie* in the Hofbibliothek at Vienna says that on p. 206, col. 2, of the *Serie cronologica de' Vescovi, Arcipreti*, etc., by Canon Gio. Giacompo Dionisi, contained in the *Nuova Difesa di tre Documenti Veronesi* by Canon Francesco Florio, one may read, "Sotti Giovanni di Forl Arciprete fiori il celebre Istorico Giovanni Diacono, visse nella Canonica dall' anno 1307 fino al 1347." Sabbadini, however, in *Scoperte dei Codici*, p. 2, n. 5, quotes L. Simeoni (in *La Famiglia di Giovanni Mansionario*, Verona, 1903) as assigning the death of the Mansionarius to December, 1337. Of Simeoni's conclusions regarding the date of composition of *Historia* and *Brevis adnotatio* I know nothing.

In the lack, then, of definite evidence concerning the date of composition of the *Brevis adnotatio* within these rather wide limits, the question is whether Tartarotti was right in the inference that he drew. I fail to see that he was. The basis for judgment is as follows. In the *Historia imperialis* (cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. CCIV,¹ fol. 8^u) the Mansionarius writes, "Eo tempore [sc. Traiani] Plinius orator et ystoricus, natione ueronensis, nunc [l. ut] in quadam ystoria legitur, floruit, qui Plinius secundus, cum prouinciam syriam regeret, etc." (following with a note on the persecution of the Christians taken from the usual Christian sources). In the *Brevis adnotatio* the author says, "Plinii duo fuisse noscuntur, eodem nomine et praenominibus appellati, hoc titulo, 'C. Plinius Secundus Veronensis Orator'. . . . Iunior Plinius titulum habet talem, 'Caïi Plinii Secundi Oratoris Veronensis Nouocomensis.'" In these two passages, then, Tartarotti thought he saw an inconsistency that could be explained only on the theory that the *Adnotatio* was composed later than the *Historia*, and in the interval the author had first become acquainted with (Tartarotti does not say, as some of his followers do, "discovered") a MS of Pliny's *Letters* that bore the longer title specified, and that first informed him on the distinction

¹This MS is probably the one said by Tartarotti to be in the possession of Scipione Maffei: the only other MS of the *Historia* known to Tartarotti was in the Bibl. Vaticelliana at Rome.

between the uncle and the nephew, which had been previously unknown to him, as apparently to most or all mediaeval writers.

It must at once be conceded that the genitive form of the name of the younger Pliny in the *Adnotatio*, and its occurrence in substantially the same style in certain extant MSS of the eight-book class, point to the fact that it was copied by the Mansionarius from a codex of the *Letters* with which he was acquainted. Later on in the *Adnotatio* he says, "Fecit etiam Plinius iste epistolarum suarum ad septitium libros octo;" and concludes with, "Haec et alia suarum epistolarum libris et in iis quae superius memoravi diligens lector inueniet." But such an inconsistency as Tartarotti imagined between the *Historia* and the *Adnotatio* does not appear. In the former work Pliny is called *orator et ystoricus*, and in the latter he is declared to be the same (*fuerunt autem Plinii magni philosophi et summi oratores ac historici*). In the former work he is said to be *natione Veronensis*, and in the latter the same thing is affirmed (*quod autem fuerit Veronensis ponit libri sexti epistula ultima ad Maximum*): but the author states that he was also styled *Nouocomensis*, because he had recently gone to reside on Lake Como.

Nor apart from all questions of a MS of the *Letters*, could the Mansionarius well have been ignorant at the time of writing the *Historia* that the younger Pliny might properly be termed *Nouocomensis*. The *Speculum historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais (†1264) was very well known to the Mansionarius before he composed the *Historia*, and Vincent's reference to Pliny is directly cited by him in the *Adnotatio*, and doubtless also was before him when he wrote the note in the *Historia*. That reference stands in cod. Vat. lat. 1962, Lib. xi (comm. x), c. 67, and in it Pliny is called *Plinius Secundus [No] uocomensis orator et historicus insignis*. If the Mansionarius chose to mention him in the *Historia* only as *natione Veronensis*, it could not have been for lack of further knowledge about him, unless the MSS of the *Speculum historiale* did not all read alike on the point referred to.

It is worth while to notice yet another point. Vincent of Beauvais had not earlier been acquainted with Pliny's *Letters*, and speaks of his new knowledge with the natural pleasure of a dis-

coverer (*eiusdem [Plinii] epistulas ad diuersos circiter centum reperi*). The Mansionarius, on the other hand, mentions the eight books of the *Letters* quite unconcernedly, as he naturally would a work that had been represented by a MS in his Chapter Library for an indefinite time, and was by no means a new thing to him, nor, as he supposed, would be, in other copies, to other students. It was apparently not a source that he thought unique. He was of course aware that Vincent of Beauvais, and plenty of other mediaeval writers, copying from one another, had confused the two Plinies, and he thought it worth while to write a brief biographical note to guard against that error for the future. But he professed to have no newly discovered material. Any *diligens lector*, he says, reading Pliny's *Letters* and "the other writers mentioned above"—Jerome, Beda, Vincent, Hugo, Eusebius, and other historians—could readily inform himself on the topic concerned. It is to me quite inconceivable that he should write in this way, if, after long years of study and practice as a historian, in the course of which he had repeated vague statements about Pliny without first-hand knowledge, he had suddenly come upon a MS of the *Letters*.

It doubtless would have been better for the Mansionarius to state in his *Historia* that he was speaking of the Pliny otherwise called *Nouocomensis*, although *natione Veronensis*; for this scrupulosity on his part would have saved more recent critics from much doubt. But the reference was only a brief one, for the purpose of mentioning, in duly pious form, the persecution, and not for the sake of mentioning Pliny. Hence there was nothing to prompt any careful discrimination at this point between the two men of the same name. It would have been quite otherwise, if the author were at the moment thinking more of the man than of the event. As it was, the common form of reference sufficed. And it is useless to expect of the Mansionarius, any more than of other men of the period, like Vincent (cf. n. 1 below), consistency and accuracy. Much

¹ This was doubtless cod. Beluacensis (postea Riccardianus), nunc Ashburnham 98, now in the Medicean Library. It may be remarked, as an indication that the Mansionarius was not alone in inconsistency (cf. p. 181) that though Vincent's codex contained Plin. Ep. iii. 5 (on the works of the elder Pliny), his text in this immediate connection still makes the two men into one, ascribing both *Letters* and *Natural History* to the same author.

more striking inconsistencies and inaccuracies than this concerning the name are ready at hand. In the *Historia* Pliny is said to have been governor of Syria at the time of the persecution; in the *Adnotatio* he is termed *praeses Hispaniarum*. The author does not feel called upon to comment on the disagreement between his own utterances, and, indeed, might be supposed to be serenely unconscious that any disagreement exists. Again, in the same paragraph of the *Adnotatio* he quotes "Suetonius Tranquillus" as authority for the statement that the elder Pliny was smothered under the ashes of Etna, and yet calmly refers to Plin. *Ep.* vi. 16, which he must have known gives quite a different story. The Mansionarius certainly was aware that Campania is not Sicily, and Vesuvius is not Etna. But, as was the case with Vincent in the instance cited, the different sections of his doubtless somewhat overloaded memory were not always geared together. He could at any given moment set down what happened to stand in his immediate source, without thinking of correcting it by his other knowledge. That is certainly what he did more than once in the *Adnotatio*; it is probably what he did in the given passage of the *Historia*.

I think it must certainly be concluded that Tartarotti's point was not well taken, and should not have commanded the following of recent critical writers. The variation between the statements in *Historia* and *Adnotatio* is a fortuitous and unimportant thing. It is no evidence that the two Plinies were really confused in the writer's mind, though they may have been in the mind of the predecessor from whom the passage in the *Historia* was copied. The Mansionarius had every reason, even when he was composing the *Historia*, to know the younger Pliny as both *Veronensis* and *Nouocomensis*. There is therefore no evidence to show that the *Adnotatio* was written after the *Historia*; and especially all the evidence is directly against the theory that an eight-book codex of Pliny's *Letters*, previously unknown, had suddenly turned up in Verona within the few years following the completion of the *Historia imperialis* (1320, or soon thereafter).

Ratherius (890-974 A. D.), bishop of Verona, who seems to have used the treasures of the Capitular Library to good purpose, was certainly acquainted with the *Letters* of Pliny; but the one direct

quotation that he makes is of a sentence which stands in all three of the MS-families, and in the same form. But the fact that he knew the *Letters* suggests that the Chapter Library in his time contained a MS of them; and there is no reason to suppose it other than the one later known to be there.

I can but believe, therefore, as the case appears to stand, that the Chapter Library at Verona, from a time before the days of Ratherius, had possessed one MS of Pliny's *Letters*, and only one; this MS contained books i-vii and ix; it was known to, and used by, Iohannes de Matociis, the Mansionarius, and by the anonymous compiler of the *Flores moralium auctoritatum*.

I may perhaps venture to express one other bit of skepticism, though I must refrain from discursive argument. I find myself unable to believe, with Sabbadini, that the three-column (Spanish uncial?) MS of Pliny's *Letters*, containing eight books, that came in 1419 into the possession of Guarino Guarini, could possibly have been other than this one codex of that content that had been reposing in the Chapter Library at Verona since before the days of Ratherius (cf. R. Sabbadini *Scoperte dei Codici*, p. 96; *Scuola di Guarino*, p. 115; *Mus. Ital. di Antich. Class.*, II, p. 432; *Epistolario di Guarino*, No. 486). Of course we must suppose some dishonesty in removing the MS from the Chapter Library at Verona, to which theft Guarino may or may not have been accessory before or after the fact. If the letter in which he announces the acquisition to his friend was actually written from Venice, may not the stolen goods have been carried there for greater safety, whether before they were offered to Guarino, or even by him after acquisition? The *nudius tertius* (cf. letter cited above) is itself no block in the way of this supposition, considering the comparatively short distance between the two cities. I would not wantonly slander the honest memory of a renaissance scholar, but in consideration of certain known facts concerning ideas about property in books prevalent at that day (and I fear to some extent in our own), one need not be too finical about suspicions. Guarino was of Verona, and probably knew what the Chapter Library contained; and in the lack of other evidence, there is no reason to suppose that the eight-book MS of Pliny's *Letters* used a century before by the florist and the

historian had meanwhile vanished without leaving a further trace behind. Other MSS had indeed been abstracted from the Chapter Library, and are now lost: Catullus and the *Letters* of Cicero to Atticus, Quintus, and Brutus—possibly also Ausonius—may be cited as examples; but these at any rate have left descendants.

In my study of the eight-book MSS, which has recently been further extended, I have been unable to trace any indication of a double source for such MSS within the early fifteenth century. All the probabilities, antecedent and otherwise, appear to me to be in favor of the belief that the MS of Pliny's *Letters* acquired by Guarino came from the Chapter Library at Verona, and was the one used by Ratherius, by Iohannes de Matociis, and by the anonymous florist.¹

As the quotations from Pliny's *Letters* in the *Flores* are apparently, so far as they go, our earliest (except for the *Brevis adnotatio*) and most immediate witness to the text of the eight-book tradition, and as they have not, I think, been printed in full, it may be of some interest to students of the *Letters* to reproduce them here. They are given in the order in which they stand in the MS; preceding each is the indication of its folio and column there; following each, its reference to the proper place in the *Letters*; abbreviations are for the most part expanded, but otherwise the spelling of the original is retained:

EX COD. BIBL. CAPIT. VERON. CLXVIII (*Flores moralium auctoritatum*):

f. 5^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro ·i· epistularum, xiiii^a epistula: Scias ipsum plurimis uirtutibus habundare, qui alienas sic amat (i. 17. 4):

f. 5^a, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·4· epistularum, ·xxv· epistula: Vbique uitia remediis fortiora (iv. 25. 5):

f. 6^a, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·3· epistularum, ·ix· epistula: Fides in praesentia eos quibus resistit offendit deinde ab illis ipsis suspicitur laudaturque (iii. 9. 26):

f. 6^a, c. 1.—Plinius in secundo epistularum: Dispice ne sit parum prouidum sperare ex aliis, quod tibi ipse non praestes (ii. 10. 5):

¹I see no reason to believe, with Sabbadini (cf. *Scoperte*, p. 3), that the Mansionarius made a copy of Pliny's letters from the Veronese codex, or owned one himself. He probably appended his *Brevis adnotatio* to the codex in the Chapter Library, from which it finally was spread abroad through the instrumentality of Guarinus (cf. also the ascription of the *Adnotatio* to Guarinus himself in cod. Vat. Lat. 5106, cited on p. 186, n. 2).

f. 8^r, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·i^o epistularum: Vt enim de pictore, sculptore, fictore nisi artifex iudicare ita nisi sit sapiens non potest percipere sapientem (i. 10. 4):

f. 8^u, c. 2.—Plinius in primo epistularum: Pompeius Iulianus tum cetera uita, tum uel hoc uno magnus et clarus quod ipse prouincie princeps inter altissimas conditiones generum non honoribus principem sed sapientia elegit (i. 10. 8):

f. 9^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·i· epistularum: Stultissimum credo ad imitandum non optima queque proponere (i. 5. 13):

f. 10^r, c. 1.—Plinius in ·i^o epistularum: Stultissimum credo ad imitandum non optima queque proponere (i. 5. 13)¹:

f. 11^r, c. 1.—Plinius primo epistularum: Si humiles et sordidas curas aliis mandas et ipse te in isto alto pingui que secessu studiis asseris. hoc sit negotium tuum, hic labor, hec requies, in his uigilie in his etiam somnus reponatur. Effinge aliquid et excude quod sit perpetuo tuum, nam reliqua rerum tuarum post te alium atque alium dominum sortiuntur, hoc nunquam tuum desinet esse si semel ceperit (i. 3. 3):

f. 11^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro primo epistularum: Proinde cum uenabere licebit auctore me ut panarium et langunculam, sit etiam pugillares feras experieris non dianam magis montibus quam minervam inerrare (i. 6. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·3· epistularum: Perire omne tempus arbitrabatur quod studiis non impenderet [*contractio fortasse legenda impenderetur*] (iii. 5. 16):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·2· epistularum: Legendi semper occasio est, audiendi non semper praeterea [*contractio fortasse legenda propterea*] multo magis ut uulgo dicitur uiua uox afficit, non licet acriora sint que legas altius tamen in animo sedent que pronuntiat uultus habitus gestus etiam dicentis affigit (ii. 3. 9):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Plinius in ·v· epistularum: Studeamus ergo, nec desidia nostre protendamus alienam sunt qui audiant sunt qui legant, nos modo dignum aliquid auribus dignum cartis elaboremus (iv. 16. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Idem in eodem: Adhuc honor studiis durat (iv. 16. 1):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Idem in eodem: Et enim nescio quo pacto magis in studiis timor quam fiducia decet (v. 17. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 2.—Plinius in ·vi· epistularum: Quid enim aut publice aut letius quam clarissimos iuuenes nomen et famam ex studiis petere aut mihi optatius quam me ad recta tendentibus quasi exemplar esse propositum (vi. 11. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 2.—Plinius in ·vi· epistularum: Equidem omnes qui aliquid in studiis faciunt uenerari mirari que soleo, est enim res difficilis ardua fastidiosa, et que eos a quibus contempnitur contempnatur (vi. 17. 5):

¹This repetition occurs in the same chapter of the *Flores* (*De imprudentia, stulticia, temeritate, ignorantia*) as the quotation just before, but with different abbreviations in the script.

f. 12^r, c. 2.—Plinius in primo epistularum: Mecum tantum et cum libellis loquor. o regiam sinceramque uitam odulce otium honestum que, ac pene omni negotio dulcius omare, o litus secretum que musionum, quam multa inuenitis quam multa dicatis [*fort. ditatis*] (i. 9. 5, 6):

f. 12^v, c. 1.—Plinius libro 2. epistularum. xi^a epistula: Inscitum est mortalibus studium magna et inusitata noscendi, sed fugien [*sed fugien manus prima deleuit*] (ii. 11. 10):

f. 13^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro i^o. epistularum: Affirmant etiam esse hanc phylosophie pulcerrimam partem, agere negotium publicum cognoscere iudicare promere et exercere iustitiam (i. 10. 10):

f. 15^r, c. 1.—Plinius libro v. epistula xx^a. Multum conuendatiore [*fortasse conuendationis*] et detrahit et affert memoria, uox, gestus (v. 20. 3):

f. 15^v, c. 1.—Plinius libro 6. epistularum: Est omnino inimicum sed usu receptum quod honesta consilia uel turpia prout male aut prospere cedunt, ita uel procedunt uel reprehenduntur. Inde plerumque eadem facta modo libertatis modo furoris nomen accipiunt (v. 9. 7):

f. 18^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro primo epistularum: Neque enim minus in perspicua in certa fallacia sunt iudicum ingenia quam tempestatum terrarum que (i. 20. 17):

f. 18^v, c. 2.—Idem in eodem libro 5: Primam religionis sue iudex patientiam debet, que pars magna iustitie est, et quedam superuacua dicuntur etiam satius est et hec dici quam non dici necessaria (vi. 2. 8):

f. 19^r, c. 1.—Plinius libro 2. epistula iii. : Nos qui in foro uerisque litibus terimur multum malitie quamuis nolimus adiscimus, scola et auditorium ut ficta [*post ficta una littera erasa*] causa, res inermis innoxia est (ii. 3. 5, 6):

f. 19^v, c. 1.—Idem libro 2. xii^a epistula: Numerantur enim sententie non poderantur, nec aliud in publico consilio potest fieri in quo nichil est tam inequale quam equalitas Nam cum sit impar prudentia, par omnium ius est (ii. 12. 5):

f. 19^a, c. 1.—Plinius libro vii^o. [*corr. m. 1 ex ii.*] epistularum: Optime autem reuerentia pudor metus iudicant (vii. 17. 8):

f. 21^r, c. 2.—Plinius in [*numero libri in lacuna omisso*] epistularum: Neque enim congruens arbitror, ut quem augere honoribus cupias huic pietatis titulis inuidere qui sunt omnibus honoribus pulcriores (iii. 8. 2):

f. 21^v, c. 2.—Plinius in 5. epistularum: Et secundis gratia casibus et aduersis caret (v. 20. 3):

f. 23^r, c. 1.—Plinius in vi. epistularum: Tam iocundum est uindicari quam decipi miserum (vi. 22. 8):

f. 23^v, c. 1.—Plinius in vii. epistularum: Nec hystoria debet egredi [*egredi corr. man. prima ex egregi*] ueritatem, et honeste factis ueritas sufficit (vii. 33. 10):

f. 26^a, c. 2.—Plinius libro .5. epistularum: Amicos plures habere multis gloriosum reprehensionem nemini fuit (v. 3. 11):

The text of the *Brevis adnotatio* is also of some interest in the same connection, if only for its quotation of some passages from the same MS of Pliny's *Letters*. But as Tartarotti, though professing to follow the older (as he judged it) of the two Vatican MSS known to him, printed a much garbled version quite out of accord with any one of the three MSS known to me to be now in that Library, and as I do not recall that it has since been reprinted, unless by A. I. a Turre Rezzonici,¹ whose *Disquisitiones Plinianae* (Parma, 1763) I have not seen, I append here for good measure, and for reference from my foregoing argument, a text of the *Brevis adnotatio* based on eight of the MSS mentioned above (p. 175). For collations of seven of these I have to thank Miss Dora Johnson, recently fellow in Latin in the University of Chicago, and now a student in the American School of Classical Studies in Rome. I have not thought it worth while to supply a complete *apparatus criticus*, except for the three quotations from Pliny's *Letters*; but I have not hesitated to correct spelling and punctuation, while leaving the curious grammar and vocabulary untouched.

The MSS used are:

Auct. F. ii. 22 (Bodleianus) = a.	Vindob. 48 = e.
Laud. MS. Lat. 52 (Bodleianus) = b.	Vatic. Lat. 3405 = f.
MS Linc. Coll. (e) Lat. 77 (Bodleianus) = c.	Vatic. Lat. 5106 = g.
Harl. 4868 (Mus. Brit.) = d.	Regin. 1472 (Vatic.) = h.

BREVIS ADNOTATIO DE DVOBUS PLINIIS VERONENSIBUS
EX MVLTIS HIC COLLECTA PER IOHANNEM
MANSIONARIVM VERONENSEM²

Plinii duo fuisse noseuntur, eodem nomine et praenominibus appellati, hoc titulo, "Gaius Plinius Secundus Veronensis Orator." In priore Plinio hoc nomen [scilicet] Secundus denotat praenominationem; in altero

¹Since this article was put into type I have been kindly informed by Professor Sabbadini, whom I have to thank also for other courtesies, that the *Adnotatio* has just been edited, or will shortly be edited, by Sig. Carlo Cipolla in *Miscellanea Ceriani* (Milano: Hoepli, 1910).

²Codd. c and h add *Oratoribus* after *Veronensibus*. In e the title runs, *Duorum Pliniorum Veronensium Vita per Iohannem Mansionarium Veronensem Breuiter Adnotata foeliciter incipit*; in f, *De Duobus Pliniis Collecta Breuiter*; in g, *Guarini ueronensis super plinii secundi epistolis*.

uero innuit ordinem numeri, ut sit a primo secundus. Iunior Plinius titulum habet talem, "Gaii Plinii Secundi Oratoris Veronensis Nouocomensis," quod uidelicet praenomen "Nouocomensis," potius quam gentile, insinuare uidetur quod "nouus" habitator "Comensis" (et praecipue iuxta Lacum Larium, qui Comanus dicitur) hic Plinius habitauerit, ubi fundos amplissimos habuit, ut colligitur eiusdem Plinii iunioris epistula ultima quarti libri ad Suram. Quod autem fuerit Veronensis, ponit libri sexti epistula ultima ad Maximum. Maior Plinius de se ipso dicit quod fuerit patria Veronensis in principio prooemii librorum Naturalis Historiae: nam introducens exemplum Valerii Catulli poetae Veronensis eum contreraneum suum uocat, scribens ad Vespasianum Augustum.

Fuerunt autem Plinii magni philosophi et summi oratores ac historici, nobilissimo genere orti, equites Romani et senatores, et ad omnia dignitatum officia meritis exigentibus promoti usque ad consularitatis insignia. Prior Plinius fuit auunculus iunioris, et ille ex sorore nepos, ut testatur ipse iunior libro tertio epistularum epistula quinta ad Macrum,¹ ubi de primo Plinio sic refert, "Pergratum est mihi quod tam diligenter libros auunculi mei lectitas, ut habere omnes² uelis,³ quaerasque qui sint omnes. Fungar indicis partibus, atque etiam quo sint⁴ ordine scripti notum tibi faciam. Est enim haec⁵ quoque⁶ studiosis non iniucunda cognitio." Scripsit autem Plinius maior, ut breuiter ex praefata epistula colligitur, De Iaculatione Equestri librum unum, De Vita Pomponii Secundi libros duos, Bellorum Germaniae Factorum libros uiginti; in arte rhetorica De Institutione Oratoris libros sex, Dubii Sermonis libros octo; tempore Neronis Imperatoris Historiarum a Fine Aufidii Bassi libros triginta et unum; Naturalis Historiae libros septem et triginta; et multa alia quae non habentur. De ipso refert Suetonius Tranquillus quod ualde miratur quod uir militaribus officiis deditus tanta componere potuit etiam ratione uitae. Nam, ut dicit Suetonius idem in libro De Viris Illustribus, dum idem Plinius legiones in Siciliam duceret, eruptione fauillarum ab Aetna eructantium praefocatus interiit anno uitae suae quinquagesimo sexto, et in Sicilia tumulatur: cui consonat Plinius nepos eius in praefata epistula ad Macrum⁷ dicens, "Miraris quod⁸ tot uolumina multaque in his scrupulosa homo occupatus absoluerit. Magis miraberis, si scieris illum aliquandiu causas⁹ dictitasse,¹⁰ et decessisse anno sexto et quinquagesimo¹¹."

¹ macrum abeg, marcum cdfh.

² omnes abg, omnis (corr. ex omnes d) cdefh.

³ uelis (corr. ex uelles d) abcdgf, uelles eh.

⁴ sunt g, sint rell.

⁵ haec bcfgh, hic a, om. de.

⁶ quaeque h, quoque rell.

¹⁰ dictitasse abdefh, dictasse c, actitasse g.

¹¹ sexto et quinquagesimo abdefh, .VI. & L. c, sexto quinquagesimo g.

⁷ macrum abeg, marcum cdfh.

⁸ quod bcegh, quot adf.

⁹ causas defgh, om. abc.

De morte uero ipsius, quia praesens erat, iunior Plinius scribit plenissime ad Cornelium Tacitum libri sexti epistula sexta decima.

Plinius iunior maioris Plinii ex sorore nepos: sic bonarum uirtutum studiis est auunculum imitatus, ut esset idem numero, si materia¹ posset in altero. Nam et iste per omnia officia Romanae urbis promotus consul fuit, deinde Africae proconsul, et postmodum praeses Hispaniarum. Hic, ut scribunt Hieronymus, Beda, et Vincentius, Hugo, et alii in Chronicis, et Eusebius Caesariensis in tertio Ecclesiasticae Historiae, dum praeses Hispaniarum esset, uidens Christianos sine causa crudeliter interfici, scripsit Imperatori Traiano, ut persecutionem Christianorum cohibere dignaretur, eo quod nihil contra Romanas agerent leges: hoc solum inuenerit² in eis, quod nescio quem Christum, eorum deum, ut dicit, ante lucanum adorant. Hic senex Romae decessit. Scripsit autem et iste libros Historiarum a principio [mundi] usque ad tempus suum LXXXVIII³ in quibus imitatur auunculum, ut de se dicit libro quinto epistularum epistula octaua ad Capitonem. Ait enim, "Me ad hoc studium⁴ historiarum impellit domesticum⁵ exemplum. Auunculus meus idemque per adoptionem pater, historias equidem⁶ religiosissime scripsit." Fecit etiam Plinius iste Epistularum suarum ad Septicium libros octo; De Institutione Artium Liberalium libros septem; Librum Virorum Illustrium a Proca rege Albanorum usque ad Cleopatram in nonaginta octo capitulis, secundum ipsorum uirorum numerum, in quo uitas ipsorum et merita mirabili et aperta breuitate describit; De Tripartitione Orbis libros sex. Item in poemate floruit. Hic auunculi uitam imitatus et mores etiam in otio aut scripsit aut legit; et si erat etiam in uenatu seu in itinere, sicut et auunculus, notarium habebat, cui equitando dictabat, ut de se dicit ad Cornelium Tacitum primi libri epistula sexta. Haec et alia suarum epistularum libris et in iis quae superius memoraui diligens lector inueniet. Vale.

¹ *lege natura, ina ex na?*

² *inuenerit deh, inueniret f, inuenitur abcg.*

³ *LXXXVIII efh, octo et octaginta d, LXXVIII ag, LXXIX b, LXXVII c.*

studium in g, studium rell.

impellit domesticum abcg, domesticum impellit defh.

equidem abcg, quidem defh, et quidem codd. Plin.

HERRICK AND MARTIAL

BY PAUL NIXON

Of English lyrists none has been more indebted to the Latin classics than Robert Herrick. A vague consciousness of this fact visited his early editors. With great dispatch, therefore, the poet was dubbed an "English Catullus"—"English Catullus" being in those days a generic term of doubtful praise or extenuating abuse applied to lyrists who sang of nakedness and were unashamed.

In the course of a most entertaining and even brilliant "appreciation" of the poet, Mr. Edmund W. Gosse, after a few pleasant remarks anent the inanity of the editors who had successively referred to the resemblance between the *Hesperides* and the *Carmina* of Catullus, declared that "no one carefully reading the *Hesperides* can fail to be struck with the similarity they bear to the Epigrams of Martial. One can hardly tell [he continued] where to look for a literary parallel more complete."¹

At the time when Mr. Gosse's essay appeared, Dr. Alexander B. Grosart was completing his huge annotated edition² of Herrick, and many of the essayist's sparkling comments clashed violently with his own sober convictions. Not the least heretical paragraphs seemed those telling, in general, of the astounding resemblance of his beloved Herrick to the shallow, irresponsible, obscene epigrammatist. With the assertion that he had taken pains to reread the *Epigrammata*, he vigorously rejected the alleged parallel, and declared that "the fingers of a single hand will sum up [Herrick's] actual indebtedness to Martial."³

So wide a difference of opinion on the part of the two men who have considered the question leaves room for further and more detailed study of the English poet's use of the poetry of Rome and of Greece. With the tacit repetition, then, of several of the

¹ *Cornhill Magazine*, August, 1876. Later included in *Seventeenth-Century Studies* (London, 1883).

² London, 1876.

³ Memorial-Introduction, p. ccxlv.

pertinent remarks with which Professor Mustard prefaces his interesting book, *Classical Echoes in Tennyson*, the writer wishes in this paper to call attention to the relation of the *Hesperides* to the epigrams of Martial.

Herrick is unique among English poets in the frequency of his expressions of admiration, affection, and solicitude for his poems and his fame. To these themes he devotes almost one-tenth of the *Hesperides*. Nearly one-ninth of the epigrams, their number, excluding the "cracker-mottos" of the last two books, being approximately the same as that of Herrick's poems, are similarly personal, and are indubitably imitated by the English poet with great freedom.

He asks his Muse whither she will roam, warns her of the contempt that dwells in courts and cities, and tells her that she would be safer at home.¹ He remarks on the difference the presence of Brutus makes in the attitude of "the virgin shy" toward his book.² He wishes his verses to be read, not in the "sober mornings,"³ but

When the rose reigns, and locks with ointment shine,
Let rigid Cato read these lines of mine.⁴

He writes of the critic who praises only departed poets,⁵ bids his book haste away and find a friendly patron, so that it may not become spice or mackerel wrapping,⁶ and declares:

I make no haste to have my numbers read:
Seldom comes glory till a man be dead.⁷

Translations and imitations of Martial can hardly be closer than these.

In an introductory quatrain the English poet ascribes to his printer all the errors of his book: the Roman epigrammatist

¹2; cf. 901; Mart. i. 3 (G.); cf. xi. 1. 1; iii. 5. 1. The numbers throughout are those of Pollard's edition of Herrick (London, 1891) except in the case of the epigrams, which he omits. These will be referred to by volume and page in Dr. Grosart's edition. Dr. Grosart gives a very incomplete list of the epigrams of Martial "to which Herrick in the slightest way alludes." Mr. Pollard adds somewhat to this list, and the epigrams mentioned by them are marked G. or P.

²4; Mart. xi. 16. 9, 10 (P.).

³Mart. xi. 17.

⁴8; Mart. x. 20. 21 (P.).

⁵174; cf. 675. 1, 2; Mart. viii. 69.

⁶846; cf. 406; Mart. ii. 27; iii. 2; iv. 86; vii. 26.

⁷625; cf. 1024; Mart. v. 10. 11, 12 (G.).

denounces his scribes in similar strain.¹ Herrick affirms, with some forgetfulness, that his Muse should be christened the "Bashful," since that adjective best fits his virgin verses—

Which are so clean, so chaste, as none may fear
Cato the censor, should he scan each here.²

Martial, one remembers, quiets any stray scruples regarding his eleventh book by alleging,

sunt chartae mihi quas Catonis uxor
et quas horribiles legant Sabinae:³

and his fifth book he inscribes to matrons, boys, and maids as one

quem Germanicus ore non rubenti
coram Cecropia legat puella.⁴

Herrick assures Porter that there will always be poets so long as there are patrons, and praises him as one who gives

Not only subject-matter for our wit
But likewise oil of maintenance for it.⁵

He curses the critic who carps at his book, but cannot mend it,⁶ derides Prat, who writes satires which contain "no mite of salt,"⁷ and says of more fortunate verse that

when all bodies meet
In Lethe to be drown'd;
Then onely Numbers sweet,
With endless life are crown'd.⁸

There is, to be sure, nothing peculiar to Martial in these sentiments, but when one remembers that the poet many times certainly imitates him, their similarity to lines of the epigrammatist seems hardly fortuitous.

Unmistakably akin to the epigrams in subject and tone, at least, are several others of the short poems of this sort. Critics who dislike the first poem they read are requested to think it the worst in the book: if they dislike all, they are commended to the

¹ Mart. ii. 8.

² 84.

³ Mart. xi. 15. 1, 2 (P.).

⁴ Mart. v. 2 (G.).

⁵ 117; cf. 359; Mart. vii. 55. 5; xii. 3. Cf. i. 107; xi. 3. 7-10.

⁶ 662; Mart. i. 91; ii. 8. 7, 8. Cf. i. 110.

⁷ 694; Mart. vii. 25. 1-3.

⁸ 201; Mart. x. 2. Cf. third stanza with Mart. x. 20. 20.

scab.¹ His readers are urged to wink at his small and hide his greater faults.² His book is ordered to

go not near
Those faces sour as vinegar,³

and he consigns to fellow or whitflaw the "long, black thumb-nail" of his detractor, who scores the verses praised by others.⁴ One can hardly fail to couple such verses with the epigrammatist's many requests that his readers skip parts of his book, if they find it too long,⁵ with his statements that a book must contain some bad poems,⁶ with his advice that it beware of the rhinoceros noses of the Romans,⁷ with his command that the

triste supercilium durique severa Catonis
frons

retire,⁸ and with his hatred of the critics who censure, while the rest of the world admires,⁹ and bite their black nails, when even Caesar condescends to read and reward him.¹⁰

Nor are Herrick's poems to literary friends unlike Martial's. The recipients whose favorable verdict will be final,¹¹ whose smile or frown can raise a poet or dash him to earth,¹² whose valuable criticism makes the poet's praise their own,¹³ and whose protection will insure the book's longevity,¹⁴ are of course familiar figures in the epigrams.¹⁵ Herrick approves of the man who not only "hugs"¹⁶ and admires, but also pays for his poems.¹⁷ Martial, too, expresses his appreciation of such a character.¹⁸ Herrick urges a friend to publish,¹⁹ and remarks that fame is the "propulsive cause" of printing.²⁰ Martial twice makes similar requests, and asks,

ante fores stantem dubitas admittere Famam
teque piget curae praemia ferre tuae?²¹

¹6; cf. 5.

²95; cf. 94.

³70; cf. 7.

⁴173; cf. 96, 344.

⁵Mart. vi. 65; iv. 82; x. 1; xi. 106; ii. 1.

⁶Mart. i. 16; vii. 90. 81.

⁷Mart. i. 3, 5, 6 (G.).

⁸Mart. xi. 2; cf. xi. 16 (G.).

⁹Mart. vi. 64; i. 40.

¹⁰Mart. iv. 27 (G.).

¹¹1064, 168.

¹²508; cf. 964, 965.

¹³949; cf. 226, 245.

¹⁴112; cf. 628.

¹⁵Mart. i. 113; iv. 86; v. 80; vi. 1; vii. 26, 51, 52; cf. i. 70; iii. 5; vii. 97; ix. 84, 99; x. 78, 104; xii. 2, 3.

¹⁶Mart. iii. 2, 6; 5, 7, 8.

¹⁷359; cf. 622.

¹⁸Mart. viii. 55; xii. 3; v. 16, 36.

¹⁹461.

²⁰450.

²¹Mart. i. 25; iv. 33.

Herrick bewails his desertion by his Muse in thanking Sir Clipseby Crew—

For those gifts you do confer
Upon him who only can
Be in prose a grateful man.¹

Worth mentioning, perhaps, in connection with this poem is the epigrammatist's demand that a prospective donor no longer await the reluctant Thalia before sending his present—

divitibus poteris musas elegosque sonantes
mittere: pauperibus munera *πρὸ* dato.²

The English poet frequently inserts in his book tiresome verses lauding some friend or other who wishes for the honor of being enrolled among his "undying saints," in his "white temple of heroes," "eternal calendar," or "generation of just." He tells them collectively:

Each lyric here shall be
Of my love a legacy,
Left to all posterity.³

Martial had assumed something—happily not so much—of the same censorial power:

gaudet honorato . . . multus nomine lector
cui victura meo munere fama datur.⁴

To Varus is given a name that will live in eternal song.⁵ The picture of Pliny in his verse will outlast the work of Apelles.⁶ Another friend is mentioned in his book at his own request,⁷ and Ovidius is promised that posterity will hear of him

si victura meis mandantur nomina chartis
et fas est cineri me superesse meo.⁸

Both poets send verses instead of gifts to friends,⁹ praise¹⁰ and damn¹¹ the work of other poets, decry plagiarism,¹² and express a

¹ 491.

² Mart. vii. 46.

³ 218; cf. 224, 365, 392, 445, 498, 512, 547, 666, 806, 861, 871, 908, 957, 979, 985, 1094.

⁴ Mart. v. 15. 3, 4.

⁵ Mart. x. 26.

⁶ Mart. vii. 84 (G.).

⁷ Mart. iv. 31 (G.); cf. v. 60.

⁸ Mart. vii. 44.

⁹ 319; Mart. ix. 99; x. 87.

¹⁰ 382, 383, 528, 606, 675, 913, 912, 958, 968, 1073; Mart. i. 7; v. 11; vii. 23, 63; ix. 26; 35; xi. 48, 50; xii. 44.

¹¹ Grosart II. 88; III. 6; Mart. iii. 9; xii. 63, etc.

¹² 683; Mart. i. 29, 52, 53, etc.

deep sense of their own greatness.¹ Both express their hope that their respective rulers may appreciate their efforts,² and both allege that only their Muse is lewd.³

With these last insignificant likenesses the resemblance of Herrick to Martial, in this part of his work, ends.

In his epigrams, however, Herrick again is influenced by his admiration of the Latin poet. The wicked husband and wife who strangely don't agree;⁴ the gentleman who is all nose;⁵ the orator who can find words only in an uproar;⁶ Boreman who remains poor despite his rascally trades;⁷ the guest who cools, and spoils, the custard by blowing on it;⁸ the unfortunate lady who coughed out two of her teeth, and spat out the other two;⁹ the man whose gout migrated from foot to hand, making his alms even smaller,¹⁰ and the thrifty Mr. Prig who drinks water instead of beer;¹¹ the girls with "rusty" teeth who should keep their mouths shut,¹² and the gentleman who cuts six new teeth, of matton-bone¹³—these curiosities appear to have been imported, almost intact, from Martial's museum.

A number of others, injured by transmission, warped by a new climate, and altered by a new surgeon, may once have been in the same collection. The husband who weeps (joyfully) when his wife is buried;¹⁴ "warie" Mr. Rush, who finds both summer and winter weather too hard on his shoes;¹⁵ the gentleman who

¹ 211, 240, 366, etc.; Mart. iii. 95; x. 2; xi. 3.

² 264, 265, 613; Mart. v. 1. 6; vii. 82; xii. 4. 11.

³ 1131; Mart. i. 4. 8 (G.); cf. xi. 15. 13.

⁴ Grosart II. 101; cf. II. 88, Upon Jolly and Jilly; Mart. viii. 35.

⁵ *Ibid.* III. 2; cf. II. 181, Upon Coone; Mart. xii. 88; vii. 95. 10, 11; vi. 36; xii. 37.

⁶ *Ibid.* III. 36; Mart. i. 97.

⁷ *Ibid.* III. 55; cf. II. 78, Upon Skrew; II. 84, Upon Eeles; Mart. xi. 66.

⁸ *Ibid.* I. 80; cf. II. 180, Upon a free Maid; II. 101, Upon Lungs; II. 163, Way in a Crowd; II. 184, Upon a sowre-breath Lady; II. 78, Upon Linnit; III. 68, Upon Gorgonius; Mart. iii. 17 (G.); i. 83 (G.); vii. 94 (G.); xi. 30; ii. 10 (G.).

⁹ *Ibid.* II. 92; cf. II. 243, Upon Franck; Mart. i. 19 (G.); viii. 57.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* II. 177; cf. I. 171, Upon Guease; Mart. i. 98.

¹¹ *Ibid.* I. 123; Mart. xii. 70.

¹² *Ibid.* II. 248; Mart. ii. 41.

¹³ *Ibid.* I. 78; cf. II. 159, Upon Ursley; II. 183, Of Horne; III. 32, Upon Mudge; Mart. ii. 41. 6, 7; v. 43; xii. 23; ix. 37; vi. 74; iii. 98; vii. 13; viii. 57; i. 72.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* II. 290; Mart. ii. 65; iv. 58.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* III. 84; Mart. xii. 87.

wears long hair to cover not his ears but their absence;¹ Peapes, who picks his teeth quite as if he had eaten beef instead of bread and cheese;² the fair lady whose painter deserves the credit,³ the perfumed damsel who alleges that she's sweet,⁴ and Judith, whose new skin fails to hide her foulness;⁵ the man with the annoying habit of stealing shoes;⁶ the host who displays an abundance of plate and a dearth of meat,⁷ and the guest who recompenses himself for his lack of appetite by borrowing the spoons and napkins;⁸ the woman with the very limited supply of hair,⁹ and the girl who says she's young despite her absent teeth;¹⁰ the one-eyed man who goes to the bath to be cured of lameness, but returns still half-blind,¹¹ economical Bungie, who keeps Lent indefinitely,¹² and Tom Brock, who cleans his running eyes, but forgets to wash his dirty mouth¹³—their near relatives, at least, are in the troupe of the Latin poet.

Finally there are the jealous wives;¹⁴ the blind¹⁵ and unsuccessful lovers;¹⁶ the heiress-hunters;¹⁷ the decrepit¹⁸ and hand-made women;¹⁹ the schoolmasters,²⁰ doctors,²¹ and cobblers;²² the debtors,²³

¹ Grosart II. 290; Mart. xii. 89; ii. 29.

² *Ibid.* II. 287; Mart. vi. 74; v. 47, 76.

³ *Ibid.* I. 171; Mart. ix. 37.

⁴ *Ibid.* II. 12; Mart. iii. 55; ii. 12.

⁵ *Ibid.* II. 62; Mart. iii. 43.

⁶ *Ibid.* II. 66; Mart. viii. 59; xii. 87, 28; xi. 54; viii. 48.

⁷ *Ibid.* II. 97; cf. III. 82, Upon Croot; II. 268, The Invitation; Mart. x. 54; iii. 12; vi. 94; x. 49; iv. 39; i. 43; ii. 19.

⁸ *Ibid.* II. 24; Mart. xii. 28.

⁹ *Ibid.* II. 155; cf. II. 172, Upon Blanch; Mart. xii. 7; vi. 57.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* II. 119; Mart. v. 45; vii. 13; viii. 57.

¹¹ *Ibid.* II. 165; Mart. vii. 13; iv. 62, 65.

¹² *Ibid.* II. 30; cf. I. 55, Great boast, small roset; II. 64, Upon Mease; II. 171, Upon Tooley; III. 45, Upon Pennie; III. 83, Upon Flood; Mart. xii. 70; v. 47, 76; xi. 32.

¹³ *Ibid.* II. 9; Mart. vi. 81; ii. 70, 42; iii. 87.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* I. 87; Mart. xii. 96.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* I. 55; Mart. iii. 8; xi. 101.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* II. 276; Mart. xi. 64.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* II. 42; Mart. i. 10; ix. 80.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* I. 156; cf. I. 107; Mart. iii. 93; x. 39, 67; ix. 29.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* I. 132; Mart. iii. 42, 55; vi. 12; ix. 37; xii. 23; i. 72.

²⁰ *Ibid.* I. 66; Mart. ix. 68; x. 60, 62; xii. 57.

²¹ *Ibid.* I. 170; Mart. v. 9; xi. 74; ix. 94, 96; vi. 53; viii. 74.

²² *Ibid.* II. 68; Mart. iii. 16.

²³ *Ibid.* I. 144; II. 64, 97; Mart. ii. 57, 3, 13, 44; iii. 41, etc.

parasites,¹ and hypocrites;² the sore-eyed³ and impotent;⁴ the greedy,⁵ stingy,⁶ pimpled,⁷ and proud;⁸ the incontinent,⁹ adulterous,¹⁰ patricidal,¹¹ and incestuous¹² performers, who do different turns for the two managers.

In his epigrams, then, as in his verses upon poetry, Herrick parallels Martial very completely so far as he goes. It is a sincere compliment to Martial, or to Martial through Jonson, for he defied Heaven and baffled Nature's hope in attempting to be a wit. When he keeps close to the Latin poet, he selects for imitation, with unerring judgment, some inferior epigram, and then often manages to spoil it utterly. When he verges upon originality, he is as humorous as the elephant that elects to walk on its driver. Nor does he have the moral purpose of the elephant.

But poems purportedly witty or sarcastic comprise only one-seventh of his work, more than one-half of Martial's. The remaining three-fourths of the *Hesperides* have comparatively little in common with the *Epigrammata*. In his few epitaphs alone does he further parallel the Latin poet with any suggestion of completeness. His lines "To Laurels"¹³ and his verses upon the "sober matron," whose

modest wedlock that was known
Contented with the bed of one,¹⁴

were apparently written in imitation of the epigrammatist; and the arrangement and tone, and sometimes the sentiment, of his epitaphs upon children¹⁵ testify to his appreciation of the tenderness of feeling and delicate perfection of form that occasionally startle us in Martial as would the discovery of a chapel in a dive. In the form, too, of his epitaph upon Mr. J. Warr,¹⁶ in his varia-

¹ Grosart III. 22; Mart. ix. 14; ii. 11, etc.

² *Ibid.* II. 211; Mart. iv. 6.

³ *Ibid.* II. 177; Mart. iii. 8; iv. 65; xii. 22.

⁴ *Ibid.* II. 156; Mart. vi. 39.

⁵ *Ibid.* II. 149; III. 38, 72; Mart. i. 11, 20, 26, etc.

⁶ *Ibid.* I. 127; Mart. i. 99; xii. 53.

⁷ *Ibid.* I. 65; II. 182, 287; Mart. i. 65; vii. 71.

⁸ *Ibid.* III. 21; Mart. v. 17.

⁹ *Ibid.* I. 138; II. 84; Mart. ix. 2; xii. 16, 33.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* II. 155, 196, 254; Mart. ii. 56, 60, 83; iii. 26, 85; viii. 31.

¹¹ *Ibid.* II. 34; Mart. iv. 70; i. 33.

¹² *Ibid.* III. 22; Mart. ii. 4; iv. 16.

¹³ 89; Mart. i. 88.

¹⁴ 116; Mart. x. 63.

¹⁵ 180, 310, 566, 642, 840; Mart. i. 88; v. 34; vi. 28, 52; vii. 96; x. 61.

¹⁶ 134; Mart. xi. 13.

tions of such stereotyped phrases as "sit terra tibi levis,"¹ and in his offer to the dead of monuments of verse in lieu of those of stone,² Herrick possibly remembers the Latin poet.

His miscellaneous verse, however, resembles the epigrams in little but its amount. One-eighth of Martial's work, one-ninth of the *Hesperides*, may be so classified. The lines on the fly inclosed in amber are frankly imitative of the epigrammatist, and those on the fly in ivory were doubtless suggested by him.³ In "A Hymn to Bacchus"⁴ he expresses his tipsy disregard of Brutus and "Cato the severe," to whom Martial so often alludes. Once he asks a friend for some wine:⁵ if he had needed precedent for such a request, he of course would not have had to turn many pages of the epigrams. Another poem laments the death of his spaniel, Tracie,⁶ but it is not absolutely necessary to suppose that he recalled the panegyric upon Issa. Nor is there anything peculiarly significant in the fact that both poets objected to hard work and small pay,⁷ alleged that they would be more generous if they had more money,⁸ wrote frequently in honor and adulation of their sovereigns,⁹ and praised their friends.¹⁰ Soame, to be sure, is described as being one of those

Not wearing purple only for the show . . .
But for true service,

and Philaenis, although she wears it day and night,

non est ambitiosa nec superba.

Suspensions of indebtedness are somewhat allayed, however, by the following line:

delectatur odore, non colore.¹¹

The rest of Herrick's miscellaneous verse not only has nothing in common with the epigrams, but is in large measure of an entirely

¹ 646, 134, 840, 642, 566, 310, 180; Mart. vii. 96. 6-8; v. 34. 9, 10; vi. 28. 10.

² 82, 376; Mart. vi. 85; x. 26; v. 15.

³ 819, 499; Mart. iv. 32 (P.); iv. 59 (G.); vi. 15.

⁴ 774; Mart. x. 20. 21 (P.); i. 8 (G.); Introduction, ix. 28; xi. 2. 6; xi. 16 (P.).

⁵ 920; Mart. ix. 53; xi. 105, etc.

⁶ 969; Mart. i. 109.

⁷ 604; Mart. x. 58. 8.

⁸ 457; Mart. ix. 54.

⁹ Dedication, 77, 161, 213, 266, 453, 687, 758, 825, 963; Mart. vii. 8; vi. 3; viii. 21; x. 6; vii. 8, etc.

¹⁰ 301, 331, 341, 427, 485, 1058; Mart. i. 39, 54, 82, 111, etc.

¹¹ 468; Mart. ix. 62.

different nature from anything that Martial, living in any age, ever would have cared to write. The doings of Oberon and Mab; the antics of the witches; old-wives' prayers and charms against fiends, sprites, and goblins; country festivals, and country superstitions, never would have been of absorbing interest to the urban wit.

Herrick, moreover, is one of the very first of our lyrists whose love of nature cannot be confused with love of a glass, or a girl, or the comfort of a shady nook by a purling stream. His quaint little biographies of the flowers, his exquisite lines, "To Blossoms" and "To Daffodils," owe nothing to Martial. But with equal enthusiasm, at least, he sometimes sings in the old familiar strain of the material and mental delights of the simple country life—

to such unknown,
Whose lives are others', not their own.
But serving courts and cities be
Less happy, less enjoying thee.¹

In two such poems he resembles the epigrammatist, whose affection for Bilbilis, for the rural estates of his friends—and for rural repose—seems to have been most sincere.² His brother's happy married life in the country is described, and the pair are bidden:

disport yourselves with golden measure
For seldome use commends the pleasure
.
.
.
in such assurance live, ye may
Nor feare, or wish your dying day.
.
.
.
know virtue: and (to) aime
More at her nature then her name.³

The second distich, at any rate, certainly is taken from Martial, and in another poem the line,

Sweet sleep that makes more short the night
comes from the same epigram.⁴

¹664; Mart. i. 55. 13, 14; x. 96; xii. 18. Cf. Herrick's description of hunting, in this poem, with Mart. i. 49. 23-26; iii. 58. 26-28.

²Mart. iv. 25, 57, 64; i. 49, 55; iii. 58; v. 71; x. 51, 58, 96; xii. 18, 31, 57.

³106; Mart. x. 47; iv. 29. 3; viii. 38. 7.

⁴664; Mart. x. 47. 11.

The chief difference between the two, however, is not, as Mr. Gosse affirms, the fact that "Herrick is as much a rural as Martial an urban poet." The vital difference is that the one is as much a love-poet and moralist as the other is a wit.

Herrick commends to the world nearly three hundred rhymed precepts and moral panaceas, of which the vast majority are definitely remembered quite as well as they deserve to be. The epigrammatist offers us only one-tenth that number of suggestions. A few of them the English poet adopts. His Cyrenaic cry,

Let's live in haste; use pleasures while we may:
Could life return, 'twould never lose a day.¹

or,

Tomorrow's life too late is: live to-day;²

his distinction between living and lasting;³ his prayer,

Fat be my hind: unlearned be my wife:
Peaceful my night: my day devoid of strife,⁴

are clearly borrowed from Martial; and when he wrote:

Each must in virtue strive for to excel;
That man lives twice that lives the first life well,

he apparently remembered:

Ampliat aetatis spatium sibi vir bonus: hoc est
vivere bis, vita posse priore frui.⁵

Common to both, too, are the sentiments:

Such as the prince is, will his people be,⁶

Let's live with that small pittance that we have;⁷
Who covets more, is ever more a slave,

and,

'Tis liberty to serve one lord; but he⁸
Who many serves, serves base servility.

¹455; Mart. vii. 47. 11, 12; ii. 90. 4 (G.).

²657; Mart. i. 15. 12 (G.); cf., for Cyrenaic sentiment, ii. 59; iv. 54; v. 20, 58, 64; viii. 44, 77, and Herrick III. 231, 459, 521, 542, 641, 808.

³1090, 672; Mart. vi. 70 (G.). Cf. viii. 77.

⁴940; Mart. ii. 90 (G.).

⁵298; Mart. x. 23; cf. viii. 77.

⁶761; Mart. ix. 79. 7, 8; xi. 4. 8; xii. 9. 4.

⁷609; cf. 608, 58; Mart. ii. 68 (G.). Cf. ii. 53; x. 47. 12.

⁸889; Mart. ii. 18. 7, 8; ii. 32. 7, 8.

Both poets profess contentment with little,¹ and at other times, with no great consistency, lament Fortune's lack of discretion,² and express their desire to have studies recompensed.³ Both are conscious that true friendship is a thing apart from property,⁴ and elsewhere praise their friends for their costly hospitality.⁵ Both speak of the comparative satisfaction of falling at the hands of a worthy enemy,⁶ dislike cruelty in the powerful,⁷ and believe that one who may sin, sins least.⁸ After the enunciation, in different phraseology, of these hackneyed sentiments, Herrick and Martial, as moralists, entirely part company. The remaining third of the *Hesperides* are love lyrics, and of such unprofitable songs the Roman poet composed only three score. Of these we hear but few clear echoes in Herrick. His poem entitled, "Upon Julia Washing Herself in the River,"⁹ the last two stanzas of the ode, "To Julia, in Her Dawn, or Daybreak,"¹⁰ and the request that his mistress

Lucrece all day be
Thais in the night to me.
Be she such as neither will
Famish me or overfill.¹¹

are hardly more than translations of the epigrammatist; and when he wrote:

Go, happy rose, and interwove
With other flowers, bind my love,

he probably was not altogether forgetful of the lines:

I, felix rosa, mollibusque sertis
nostri cinge comas Apollinaris.¹²

The girl, too, who is whiter than swans, snow, lilies, pearls, ivory, cream, and moonlight,¹³ and those who smell sweeter than incense, spices, ambers, musk, dewy fields, vineyards, pomegranates, balm,

¹ 100; Mart. x. 96; i. 55.

² 691; Mart. v. 81; x. 14.

³ 1035; Mart. i. 76; v. 16, 56.

⁴ 576; Mart. xi. 44.

⁵ 377; Mart. iv. 64.

⁶ 141; Mart. *Spect.* 32.

⁷ 599; Mart. vi. 83.

⁸ 270; Mart. i. 73.

⁹ 941; Mart. iv. 22 (G.).

¹⁰ 826; cf. 104, 193, 417; Mart. viii. 68. 7, 8; iv. 22 (G.).

¹¹ 667; Mart. xi. 104. 21, 22 (P.); i. 57 (G.).

¹² 238; Mart. vii. 89. 1, 2.

¹³ 105; Mart. v. 37; i. 15. Cf. viii. 28.

myrrh, nard, wine, flowers, beehives, and the phoenix-nest, are at least very suggestive of Martial's girls and boys in their complex whiteness and sweetness.¹ In one poem, particularly, Herrick exhausts his ingenuity, and his readers, in naming fragrant things before he tells us the purport of it all—

Thus sweet she smells, or what can be
More lik'd by her or lov'd by me.

We should have been spared the suspense, probably, but for Martial.²

Less certainly the epigrammatist's is the responsibility for Herrick's desire for the girl who is coy but not unkind,³ and for a wife who is not too rich,⁴ for his reflections on his inability to be constant in love,⁵ and for his resolve to have no spouse but a sister.⁶ It is no more than imitation of general sentiment, at most. Finally come a number of tastes and convictions which both poets happen to have in common—a liking for lips that rival roses,⁷ for multitudinous kisses⁸ and certain preferences therein,⁹ a dislike of painful neatness in appearance,¹⁰ a consciousness of the strife between beauty and chastity,¹¹ a knowledge of the nothingness of a woman's "Nay,"¹² of the credulity of the lover,¹³ and of the fact that love begets love.¹⁴

The rest of Herrick's love lyrics, between three and four hundred in number, take us to another world than Martial's, a world wherein petticoats and stomachers, ribbons and carcanets, amorous sighs and frozen hearts, are the great, eternal verities. Only once

¹ 283, 375, 179, 54, 155, 251, 327, 415, 418, 487, 721, 807; Mart. iii. 65; v. 37; vi. 55; xi. 8.

² 375; Mart. xi. 8. Cf. form of 342 and iv. 42; 876, 337, 1020, and ix. 90. 13-18.

346, 1086, 143, 149, 951; Mart. i. 57 (G.); iv. 29, 38, 42; v. 46, 83.

⁴ 496; Mart. viii. 12.

⁵ 249, 519; Mart. vi. 40.

⁶ 31; Mart. xii. 20. Dr. Grosart refers to I Cor. 9:5 as the source of this poem!

⁷ 23, 45, 337; Mart. iv. 42.

⁸ 74, 87; Mart. vi. 34. Catullus is probably their common source.

⁹ 799; Grosart II. 302; Mart. xi. 23, 26, 104; viii. 46; xiii. 18.

¹⁰ 83; Mart. ii. 36 (G.).

¹¹ 136, 513; Mart. viii. 54.

¹² 737; Mart. iv. 71, 81. Cf. iii. 90; xii. 75.

¹³ 10; Mart. iii. 15.

¹⁴ 748; Mart. vi. 11.

or twice convincingly sincere, but always musical, Herrick's verses, gay or plaintive, pensive or triumphant, complimentary or advisory, to his fair, imaginary mistresses will probably never lose their place among the most captivating and delightful trifles in the language. Through them we first become acquainted with the poet; to them we most frequently return; and in them, in their number as in their form and content, we have further and conclusive evidence that the prevailing interests and the real genius of the poet were not akin to Martial's. The points of contact between the two, though numerous, are relatively unimportant; the long lines of divergence are fundamental. Of the three Latin poets whom Herrick most frequently imitates, Martial is certainly the one whom he least desired to rival.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE
Brunswick, Me.

NOTES UPON THE EPHODIA OF GREEK AMBASSADORS

By W. L. WESTERMANN

The expense-money granted to Greek ambassadors has received passing attention in Pauly-Wissowa under the word *ἐφῳδία*, and in the excellent treatment of ancient Greek ambassadorial relations by M. Ch. Lécivain in the Daremberg-Saglio dictionary.¹ The following notes are the result of an attempt to determine more accurately the rate of the *ephodia* paid to the *presbeis*, who journeyed ceaselessly to and fro between the Greek city-states.

It is impossible to arrive at even an approximate estimate of the total amount expended for this purpose by any one city in a given year. From the literature and inscriptions, however, one has the distinct impression that it was an appreciable item of the state expenditure, for the Greek embassies were sent out upon every sort of pretext arising out of the diplomatic relations between the city-states.² The connection of the state and its religion in the ancient world necessitated the sending of sacred embassies, *θεωπρίαι*, which represented their states before the oracles or at the sacred games. The lack of a system corresponding to the modern diplomatic organization, by which representatives of the different nations are maintained regularly in foreign countries, increased the number of special embassies beyond anything which the modern world knows. Moreover, it must be remembered that the Greek states, through the medium of the *presbeis*, accomplished much that in modern times is done through the agency of the postal service and the telegraph. An indication of the importance of this item of the state budget among the Greeks is seen in an Abderitan inscription of the second century B. C.³ Even in the city of Abdera, relatively unimportant among the Asia Minor cities of that period, the cost of sending embas-

¹ See the article in Vol. III entitled "legatio."

² For a partial enumeration of these see Daremberg-Saglio, *op. cit.*

³ *Bull. Corr. Hell.* IV, p. 47, l. 48 of the inscription published by Pottier and Hauvette-Beaumont.

sies is met out of an especial fund reserved for ambassadorial expenditure, ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὰς πρεσβείας. In Athens, however, the money is paid out of a general fund, ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ἀναλίσκομένων τῇ δῆμῳ,¹ reserved for the expenditures allowed by special decrees of the Assembly.

The dignity of the sovereign states naturally demanded that the *presbeis* travel in a manner which would command the respect of the states visited. The amount of the *ephodia* must have been reckoned with this in mind. The *Acharnians* of Aristophanes reflects something of the old conservative attitude of the simple Attic peasant toward the luxury indulged in by the state ambassadors when on their travels. The *presbeis* who return from the Great King² announce to the Assembly: "Ay, and we were dreadfully bored in strolling along the Caystrian plain under awnings, lying luxuriously in coaches, fairly done to death. When we were entertained we were forced to drink sweet unmixed wine out of glass beakers and golden goblets." A later portion of the *Acharnians*³ seems to embody the popular protest against the number of embassies which were being sent out and the fact that the urbane and polished young Athenians were chosen for this work. It was no more than natural, indeed quite necessary, that the *presbeis* should be of this new type, trained in the school of sophistry, in order to represent the sovereign city of Athens fitly before the other Greek assemblies and at the courts of tyrants or of foreign kings. The protest of Aristophanes is not one directed against class privilege, since the Assembly itself determined the composition of its embassies. The comic poet expresses only the disgust of the Conservatives that they are being thrust back into the wings of the Athenian political stage, whereas the younger set, the representatives of the new intellectual movement, occupy the stage center. There is no indication in the *Acharnians* that money may be made by the *presbeis* out of ambassadorial work.⁴ Therefore it is apparent that the standard of living required

¹ Cf. Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 152, l. 45, and article in Daremberg-Saglio.

² Aristophanes *Achar.*, ll. 68 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 604-6.

⁴ In one passage (l. 136) Theoros, the ambassador who returned from Thrace, says that the embassy would not have stayed long in Thrace, and Dicaeopolis interrupts, "No, by God, unless your pay was large." Even here there is no intimation that the ambassadors returned with their pockets lined with money saved out of the expenses granted them.

of the members of the embassy was such that *ephodia* fairly represented the actual expenses of the journey and left little or nothing over.

The safest point of departure for the present discussion is found in two decrees of the Athenian Assembly which record missions to Macedon. The first is a decree of the *Boule* and the *Demos* giving thanks to the Athenian embassy to Macedon and to the Macedonian embassy still present at Athens which had been instrumental in bringing about the treaty of alliance between Athens and King Amyntas.¹ The date is shortly before 370 B. C. The terms had just been agreed upon, and the Assembly passes the customary vote empowering an embassy to go to Macedon and exact the usual oath from Amyntas. The treasurer of the *Demos*, ταμίης τοῦ δήμου, is to pay to each of those who are chosen twenty drachmas as *ephodia*. The inscription runs στοιχηδόν, and there can be no question of the correctness of the reading, which is as follows: δοῦναι δὲ τοῖς πρέσβεσ[ιν τοῖς] αἰρεθείσιν εἰ[ς ΕΦ]ΟΔΙΑΔΔΔΡ[ΑΧΜΑΞΕ]ΚΑΞΤΩΙ. There is no spacing upon either side of the numerals Δ, and hence no chance of a mistake.² Estimating four days for the trip by boat around Sunium to the port of Alorus and one day more to Pella, the trip to and from Pella would occupy ten days.³ The business of this embassy was merely to exact the oath. Let us allow three days for the execution of this simple business and the regular formality of a public dinner to the embassy. The twenty drachmas would allow, if we accept the estimate of thirteen days as about correct, slightly over one and one-half drachmas per day for each man.⁴

The second decree⁵ deals with an embassy of one man who goes to Macedon about 348 B. C. It corroborates the testimony of the inscription just discussed. The business of the ambassador was merely to announce to Iatrokles, an Athenian captive in the hands of Philip, that the Assembly was looking after his welfare. The

¹ Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 78; Hicks and Hill, No. 107.

² See *IG* II. 1, Addenda, pp. 397 and 423.

³ Cf. Götz *Die Verkehrswege im Dienste des Welthandels*, p. 260. For the distance from Athens to Thessalonica the estimate is four days.

⁴ Cf. P. Foucart in *Bull. Corr. Hell.* (1889), p. 457, who reckons on the basis of a drachma a day for an embassy to Delphi.

⁵ *IG* II. 5. 1106. Cf. Aeschines, *περὶ τῆς παραπροσβέλας*, 15.

ephodion granted is twenty drachmas. The trip was presumably to Pella, although this is not definitely stated in the inscription; and it seems unnecessary to allow more than three days for the duty imposed upon the *presbeus* in question. Again the reading $\Delta\Delta\Delta\text{PAXM}$ is unquestioned, since the numerals are not spaced or set off by punctuation marks.

An interesting inscription¹ of the year 357-56 relates to the troubles which arose in Euboea in the year before this date, when Eretria was attacked by some Euboean cities, with the connivance of Thebes.² The Carystians, however, came to the aid of Eretria, which along with Chalcis, Hestiaea, and Carystus remained true to its Athenian alliance. The first part of the decree is lacking. It dealt with an alliance between Athens and some city of Euboea other than the four mentioned, since there would be no occasion for a new alliance with them. I judge that the new understanding was with one of the revolting cities. The ambassadors who conducted the negotiations which resulted in this alliance received ten drachmas each.³ A second embassy had gone to Eretria, Chalcis, and Hestiaea. It must have stopped at least one day in each place, more probably two. The payment was twenty drachmas to each man, and the reading is again clear. A third embassy had gone to Carystus. To its members the treasurer of the *Demos* is authorized to pay ten drachmas.⁴ The word *ἐκάστω* is not there, but this is undoubtedly an omission of the stonemason. The inscription reads: $\text{ΤΟΥΔΗ} \wedge \Delta\Delta\text{PAXMA}\Sigma$. With some misgiving Koehler⁵ made the restoration *τοῦ δήμου Δ δραχμάς*. An estimate of the distance to Carystus and a comparison with the pay accorded to the embassy which negotiated in the three cities, Eretria, Chalcis, and Hestiaea, makes the restoration of Koehler secure.

An estimate based upon Demosthenes *περὶ τῆς παραπροσβείας*,

¹ *IG* II. 1, No. 64 and II. 5, p. 22. Cf. Koehler *Mittheilungen des d. archaeologischen Instituts zu Athen* II, p. 211.

² Dittenberger *Sylloge*², Nos. 109, 110.

³ *Ibid.*, 109, l. 19. Koehler, *op. cit.*, estimates six days for the journey and work of this embassy: "So fallen auf den Tag 1 Drachme 4 Obolen."

⁴ See *IG* II. 5, No. 64, l. 13.

⁵ *Mittheilungen des d. archaeologischen Instituts zu Athen* II, p. 211: "Die Zahl kann auch $\Delta\Delta$ gewesen sein."

sec. 390 (158), gives approximately the same result for ambassadorial expense-money as that deduced from the inscriptions. The embassy in question was composed of ten¹ Athenians who were sent to Philip in the year 346. In carrying out their commission they spent about seventy days away from Athens.² The entire expense is given as 1,000 drachmas, which would be at the rate of $1\frac{3}{10}$ drachmas per day for each ambassador.

For the period from 370 to 340 B.C., within which all the sources fall which have so far been used, the *ephodia* were evidently voted by the *Demos* on the following calculation. A rough estimate was made of the number of days needed to carry out the commission and return to Athens. The amount was then voted in some multiple of ten—ten, twenty, thirty, fifty, a thousand drachmas, on a basis of a necessary expense of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachmas per day. I have found no variation from the round number in any inscription which gives the *ephodia*.

In the *Acharnians* the *ephodia* of the *presbeis* has developed, in the imagination of Dicaeopolis, to two and three drachmas per day. The comic touch in l. 130 seems to have escaped entirely the appreciation of the scholiasts and modern commentators. To Amphytheos the gods had turned over the commission of making peace with Sparta. But the prytanists will not grant him the *ephodia*. Dicaeopolis wishes to obtain a separate peace for himself, children, and wife, and he is willing to pay to Amphytheos the *ephodia*—eight drachmas! Imagine the effect upon an Athenian audience, accustomed to sit in the Assembly and vote expense-money in multiples of ten. Blaydes' explanation shows the utter want of appreciation of the humor of it. "Hanc mercedem ei ut legato dat, nempe pro singulis diebus binas drachmas. Bidui enim iter ab Athenis ad Lacedaemona, et vice versa, fuit." Blaydes refers to Herodotus VI, 120, where the Spartan troops reach Marathon *τριταῖοι*, but after a forced march, *ἔχοντες πολλὴν σπουδὴν*. Even Phidippides reached Sparta only upon the second day.³ If we allow three days for the trip of the embassy to Sparta, three for the return, and three,

¹ Boeckh *Kleine Schriften*, IV. 289.

² Boeckh *Staatshaushaltung*, 3d ed., I. 303 and n. f.

³ Herodotus, VI. 106.

at least, for the negotiations, the humor of the eight drachmas is apparent. It is as though a populist and economical administration should send an embassy to Europe and grant them "six bits" a day for expense-money. It is a melancholy task to explain a joke.

Accepting $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachmas a day as the rough estimate upon which the *ephodia* were based, it is possible to settle a doubtful restoration by Koehler in an Athenian decree of the year 361-60.¹ In this year, after the battle of Mantinea, the restored *κοινόν* of the Thessalians entered into a "perpetual" alliance with Athens. The Assembly voted to send five men, chosen at large from the citizen-body, *ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων*, who are to go to Thessaly and "exact the oath from Agelaus the Archon, the Polemarchs, the Hipparchs, the Hippeis, the Hieromnemones, and the remaining magistrates who rule over the *Koinon* of the Thessalians." The treasurer of the *Demos* is to give to the ambassadors *εἰς ἐφόδια Δ δραχμῆς*. In Koehler's copy of the inscription² the text appears as follows, with the letters immediately above and below:

. ΤΟΙΞΔΕΓΡΕΞ
ΕΙΞΕΦΟΔΙΑ Δ ΔΡΑΧ
ΑΝΑΓΡΑΥΑΙΤΟΝ

There is no mutilation above or below the vacant spaces which set off the numeral Δ.

Kumanudis³ inserted a second Δ in the vacant space after the numeral. Koehler supplied a third in the vacant space before it. This gives thirty drachmas per man, *ἐκάστῳ*, for an embassy whose only duty is to go to Thessaly and take the oath of the magistrates of the Thessalian *Koinon* and the division commanders of the army. At the estimated rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachmas a day the *Demos* would be allowed, in twenty days for the execution of this commission. Note that there is no mutilation around the numeral. Recall that in the inscriptions upon the embassies to Macedon, to Amyntas, and to Philip the pay was twenty drachmas; for the embassy to the three Euboean cities also twenty drachmas. If we allow three days for the trip to Thessaly, which is surely liberal, three for the return and three

¹ Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 108.

² See *IG* II, 5, No. 59b.

³ *Ἀθήναιον*, V, p. 424.

days for the taking of the oath, the rate of pay would even so be $1\frac{1}{10}$ drachmas per day. I have no doubt that the reading should be ten drachmas. The spaces before and after the numeral are left vacant to set it off, as frequently in inscriptions after 420 B. C.¹ In the same inscription, four lines below, Koehler himself leaves a similar space on the right side of the numerals $\Delta\Delta$.²

An Athenian decree passed between 307 and 300 B. C. records the vote of a golden crown and a bronze statue to Asclepiades of Byzantium in return for the good-will and munificence which he has shown to the kings, the people of Athens, and the rest of the Hellenes.³ The decree further provides that an embassy of three men be sent to Byzantium, who are to request that the people of Byzantium publicly declare the honor accorded to Asclepiades, in the theater at the time of the Dionysiac festival. To each of the ambassadors the treasurer of the *Demos* is to give an *ephodion* of fifty drachmas.

If we accept the estimate made by Götz⁴ of five days for the sail to Byzantium, which would seem little enough, and even ten days for the transaction of the business required by the state, the calculation gives a daily *ephodion* of $2\frac{1}{2}$ drachmas per man. In the literary sources there are indications that embassies were sometimes delayed a long time before they could accomplish the state business which had been delegated to them. An instance in point is the length of time spent by the Athenian embassy to Philip upon the mission of the year 346 B. C. An inscription of the year 446-45 which records the alliance between Athens and Chalcis⁵ shows that the delay in presenting foreign embassies to the *Boule* and Assembly at Athens had become an abuse which required definite correction. The oath sworn by the Athenian *Boule* and dicasts contains the following clause: "And I shall present to the *Boule* and the *Demos* within ten days any embassy which may come, whenever I am a

¹ See Larfeld *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* II. 552.

² In Hicks and Hill, No. 123, the reading of the stone, *eis tephodia Δ δραχμας*, is retained.

³ *IG* II. 1, No. 251.

⁴ Götz *Verkehrswege*, p. 260.

⁵ Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 17.

member of the prytany."¹ In the matter of the embassy to Philip, however, very unusual circumstances helped to bring about the delay. Philip himself was anxious to put off swearing the oath as long as possible until he had some Thracian fortresses in his power. He created plausible causes of delay, such as the request that they assist him in the work of reconciling the Pharsalians and Haliaians.² The demand of the Chalcidians in the inscription cited above set ten days as the maximum delay permissible at Athens before the Chalcidian embassies should be presented to the *Boule* and the Assembly. Consequently I conclude that in most cases even at Athens, where the demands upon the time of the *Boule* were great, ambassadorial business was customarily handled in a shorter time. These are the only two cases which have come to my attention where the Greek embassies were detained for an unreasonable length of time.³

An inscription which records an alliance between Magnesia and Smyrna⁴ offers as safe a basis as I could find upon which one may proceed to reckon the time usually required to complete an ambassadorial mission. The *probouleuma* as it appeared before the Assembly of Smyrna provided that three *presbeis* be chosen "who shall take

¹I had cited Xen. *Resp. Ath.* III. 1, as another example to show that embassies were sometimes long delayed. The statement is that sometimes a man could not obtain admission to the Senate and Assembly at Athens though he sit waiting an entire year. Professor Shorey has pointed out to me that this remark in all probability does not refer to embassies, since in the enumeration of the Senate's duties, which follows this passage, the reception of embassies is not mentioned. The form of the statement, *ἀνθρώπῳ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ χρηματίζειν τῇ βουλῇ*, also makes it improbable that embassies were in the author's mind. We have a number of instances of embassies of one man. Usually, however, they numbered three or more members, rather than a single person, as would be the case if this passage referred to embassies.

²Schaefer *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* (ed. 1886), II. 265.

³The Spartan embassy mentioned by Andocides, *περὶ εἰρήνης*, secs. 33, 34, may have remained in Athens for forty days, although this is very doubtful. Granted that they did so, the case is quite unusual. Andocides had been a member of the Athenian embassy which went to Sparta in 391 B. C. with full powers to negotiate a peace. They returned to Athens without taking any definite action, preferring to present the counter propositions of Sparta to the Athenian Assembly. At the request of the Athenian embassy the Spartans had granted to the Athenian Assembly forty days in which to come to a decision, and they sent a Spartan embassy to make their formal proposals. We know that the Spartan ambassadors returned without concluding the peace. It is impossible to tell how long they remained at Athens.

⁴Hicks *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, No. 176; Dittenberger *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, I, No. 229, ll. 25 ff. The date is approximately 243 B. C.

up to them (the Magnesians) the articles of agreement which may seem good to the *Demos*, and shall discuss with them what is written in the agreement, and ask them to accept it and carry out its provisions. . . . To the *presbantai* who shall have been appointed let Callinus the treasurer give expense-money (*μεθόδιον τὸ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*), at the legal rate for as many days as the *Demos* may grant, out of the revenues of the city. Five days were allowed." This is followed by the names of the three ambassadors.

The distance from Smyrna to Magnesia is less than twenty-five miles. One day is sufficient for this trip, even on foot. This leaves three days for the transaction of business and the banquet in the *prytaneum*, an honor which was accorded to the Magnesians who had come to Smyrna (l. 36). This is surely about as fast as diplomatic work of this kind could be completed. It seems safe, therefore, taking three days as the absolute minimum number of days required for a mission which had to treat with a foreign state, to assume that ten days would cover the actual time spent by the embassy to Asclepiades of Byzantium in that city.¹ This ought to allow for all ordinary delays, such as festivals and the like. It is clear, therefore, that the rate of the *ephodia* was considerably raised at Athens in the period after 346 B. C., the date of the embassy mentioned by Demosthenes, which was paid at the old rate of 1½ drachmas.

The rise in the *ephodia* which we have thus established can be more accurately dated, through an Athenian decree of the year 325-24,² which records the mission of a single ambassador to Dionysius, tyrant of Heraclea on the Pontus. The *presbeus* is granted fifty drachmas *εἰς ἐφόδια*. Heraclea is about one day from Byzantium. The sum is clearly reckoned upon the same rough basis as that in the later decree upon the embassy to Byzantium. Fifty drachmas was apparently the customary estimate of the Athenian

¹In the earlier part of the paper (pp. 205-6) I have assumed that three days ought to suffice for the actual work of embassies whose duty was only to exact the oath. The embassy would appear formally before the proper officials upon the first day, the oath could be administered upon the second, and the banquet could be held upon the third day. Upon the fourth the embassy could start upon its return. In all cases I have tried to make the estimate large enough to be safe.

²Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 152.

Assembly for the trip to the region about the Propontis at the end of the fourth century.

A badly mutilated inscription found at Arcesine on the island of Amorgos¹ gives further evidence of an increase in the *ephodia* rate. It is a decree of the League of the Islands and falls probably within the reign of Ptolemy II, 285–46 B. C. It deals with public money advanced by the sacred bank at Delos to the cities of the islands.² There is a provision that certain persons are "to be present in," and below this the remaining letters read εἰς ἐφόδιον ἐκάσ[τω . . . δρα]χμὰς τρεῖς εἰς]. . . . Whether the restoration of the word δικαστῶν made by M. Delamarre is correct or not, the thought is clear, namely, that the representatives of the cities are to receive each an *ephodion* of three drachmas, and undoubtedly this is the rate for each day. Delamarre has restored ἐκάσ[τοι καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν δρα]χμὰς τρεῖς.

The restoration ἐκ τοῦ[νόμου], in the Smyrnaean inscription cited above, was made by Boeckh,³ and has been accepted by all the later editions. There are several Athenian inscriptions which prove that at Athens also a set rate of pay had been fixed by law or by custom for ambassadorial *ephodia*. An embassy⁴ which goes up to King Spartocus of the Bosphorian kingdom in the year 286–85 is to be paid ἐφόδια . . . τὸ τεταγμένον, "the regular, or fixed, amount." The expense incurred in the publishing of this decree and the sending of this embassy is to be met by the "officials in charge of the treasury," τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει. The Assembly no longer determines the amount of the *ephodia*. This power rests at this date with the new "treasury officials." They made the reckoning of the days required for the trip, as the Assembly had formerly done, on the basis of the fixed rate. This rate cannot be determined; but it was presumably the $2\frac{1}{2}$ drachma rate of the period following Alexander, or possibly higher.

The change in the Athenian treasury department which is indicated in the new title τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει must have occurred

¹IG XII, fasc. 7, No. 13.

²M. Delamarre, in *Revue de Philologie* XXVIII (1904), 98.

³CIG 3137.

⁴Dittenberger *Sylloge*², No. 194.

after 307 B. C.¹ For in the honorary decree to Asclepiades of Byzantium,² of the period 307-300 B. C., the *Tamias* of the *Demos* is still the official authorized by the Assembly to pay out the *ephodia* in amounts definitely fixed by the Assembly. It is well known that the organization of the Athenian state underwent important modifications during the rule of Demetrius, and upon the liberation of Athens from Demetrius' sway in the years 288-86 B. C.³ The loss of the right to fix the amount of the *ephodia* on the part of the Assembly is in itself of little importance. Yet the thought suggests itself that this slight decrease in the competence of the Assembly and corresponding increase in that of the treasury officials is a heritage of the tyranny of Lachares and the "freedom" under Demetrius.

In the year 172-71 B. C. it is the *ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν* at Athens who advances the money to ambassadors. A decree of this year⁴ empowers him to reckon and pay out the *ephodion*, τῷ δὲ χειροτονηθέντι ἀνδρὶ μερίσαι τὸ ἐφόδιον τὸν ταμίαν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν. It is evident from the use of the expression τὸ ἐφόδιον that the set rate for the *ephodia* was still maintained.

A comparison of the *ephodia* rate with the wages earned by laborers at Athens at two different periods shows conclusively that the deduction made from the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes is correct. The *ephodia* remained, throughout the fifth and fourth centuries at least, exactly what they purported to be, namely, an advance by the government which would approximately defray the traveling and living expenses of the ambassadors while engaged upon the special mission for the state. The building accounts for the Erechtheum⁵ state that *πρίσται*, which probably means stonecutters here, receive one drachma a day, the architect a drachma, and unskilled labor a like wage. We may regard this then as the living wage of the

¹Cf. Busolt *Die gr. Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer* (Iwan Müller Sammlung, IV. I.) I, 237, n. 6.

²See *IG* II. 1, No. 251.

³See Wilamowitz *Phil. Untersuchungen*, IV. 201; and Niese *Geschichte der gr. und maked. Staaten*, I. 358, n. 5.

⁴Dittenberger *Oriens Graeci Insc.* II, No. 771, l. 54.

⁵Cf. Jevons "Work and Wages in Athens," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XV (1895), 240.

free laborer. Certainly the one and one-half drachmas per day, which has been established as the approximate basis for the *ephodia* between the years 370 and 346 B. C., cannot have done much more than meet the necessary expenses of the *presbeis*. About the same ratio between the wage of free labor and the *ephodia* of ambassadors holds good also for the end of the fourth century. Building accounts from Eleusis, of the year 329-28 and of about ten years later, prove that unskilled labor was then earning a drachma and a half, skilled labor as high as two or two and a half drachmas.¹ I have tried to show above that the *ephodia* rate was about two and a half drachmas after 325 B. C.

Keeping in mind the expenses incurred in travel, the *ephodia* of the ambassadors seem moderate enough when compared with the fees paid at Athens for state service. When the *ephodia* were calculated at $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachmas daily, the Archons were receiving 4 obols a day,² the dicasts' pay was 3 obols, the payment accorded to members of the *Boule* was 5 obols. The Amphietyones, who administered the funds of the Delian temple, received a drachma per day, the Athenian governor over Salamis and the officials sent to Samos, Skyros, Lemnos, and Imbros a like amount.³

The higher rate of the *ephodia* which first appears in the inscription of the year 325-24 stands in an unusually close relation to a movement in prices and wages in Greece which Beloch has called a "Preisrevolution."⁴ The rise in the price of wheat, barley, and cattle was accompanied by a corresponding advance in wages, attested in the Eleusinian building inscription of 329-28. The rise in the fees paid for the attendance upon the *ecclesia*, to a drachma for the other meetings and nine obols for the *κυρία ἐκκλησία* was undoubtedly necessitated by the general increase in wages and prices.⁵ The *ephodia* were in the same way affected by the general

¹ See Jevons *op. cit.*

² Gilbert *Greek Const. Antiquities* (ed. 1895), p. 222, n.4; cf. Aristotle *Pol. Ath.* 62, 2.

³ Arist. *Pol. Ath.* 62, 2.

⁴ Beloch *Griechische Geschichte* II. 355 ff.

⁵ Arist. *Pol. Ath.* 62; Beloch, II. 358. The explanation sometimes given for the increase in the payment for attendance upon the *ecclesia* is the superficial one of demagoguery and a desire to curry favor with the proletariat. See Kenyon *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*, note to chap. lxii. This reason is hard to reconcile with the

advance in the standard of living, although the pay of the state officials mentioned above was not raised, at least until after the date of the Polity of the Athenians.

The inscription of the year 325-24 giving the embassy to Heraclea, which I used in determining the $2\frac{1}{2}$ drachma rate, has been thoroughly discussed by Ulrich Koehler in an article upon "Attische Psephismen aus den Jahren der Theuerung."¹ Chiefly upon the evidence of this inscription he dates a crisis at Athens, lasting from 330 to 325 B. C., when a sudden rise in the price of wheat forced the state to energetic measures to obtain grain for its poorer citizens at a low price.² Beloch correctly remarks³ that the speculations in grain of Cleomenes of Naucratis, the financial governor of Egypt under Alexander, cannot be responsible for this crisis, although they may have augmented it. Neither in Beloch nor in Koehler's article is there any suggestion of the connection between the crisis at Athens and the great sums of gold and silver thrown into circulation by Alexander, especially in 331 B. C. In this year the old Persian treasuries of Susa and Persepolis, 170,000 talents if the ancient accounts may be trusted, fell into the hands of the young and lavish prince. How quickly it came into circulation and how soon its effect would be felt in Greece itself may be surmised from the fact that Menes, the newly appointed governor of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia, was given the sum of 3,000 talents to assist Antipater in the war against King Agis.⁴ Much of this money must have gone immediately into Greece. In the same year Alexander dismissed his Greek allies, who returned home with full pay and 2,000 talents as an additional gift.⁵ The direct effect of these sums upon the market of Greece and the indirect effect of the vast amounts paid out in Asia by this princely young spender must have been great.

well-known poverty of the Athenian state at the time of the Social War and the careful administration of its finances under Eubulus and Lysicrates. Certainly the *ephodia* and the pay of the ecclesiasts were more closely dependent upon the actual cost of living than the payment of the higher officials.

¹ *Athen. Mittheilungen*, VIII (1883), 211 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 167.

³ *Geschichte Gr.* II. 356, n. 4.

⁴ Niese *Geschichte der gr. und makedonischen Staaten*, I. 95.

⁵ Niese I. 99.

This sudden increase in the gold and silver supply of the western Asiatic and Greek world must as inevitably have caused a rise in prices as the discovery of gold in California in 1849 did in our middle-western and eastern states within the succeeding five years. The average wholesale price of food-stuffs rose from 79 in 1849 to 101.2 in 1853, the average price of all commodities from 98.7 to 109.1.¹ The rise in prices is already marked in the report of the year 1850. The corresponding increase in wages does not appear so quickly; but the average wages rose from 92.5 in 1849 to 98 in 1855.² In the same years (1849-53), according to Sauerbeck's statistics, the average cost of total food in England rose from 74 to 102, a rise of about 38 per cent.³ In his summary of tables at the end of the article from which these data are taken, Sauerbeck gives no other large cause for the rise than the gold discoveries in Australia and California. The means of communication and transportation between the Persian cities and Greece in Alexander's day were decidedly better than those between California and the Mississippi River in 1850. I judge, therefore, that the stimulus to the money-market of Greece from the opening of the Persian treasuries would certainly show itself within a year.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

¹ See the Aldrich Senate Report on Wholesale Prices, Wages, and Transportation, *Senate Reports*, Vol. III, Part I (1893), p. 100.

² *Ibid.*, p. 176.

³ Augustus Sauerbeck "Price of Commodities and Precious Metals," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, XLIX (1886), 581 ff.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

PASSER

Catull. *Carm.* ii

The charm of this poem, blurred as it is by a corrupt manuscript tradition, has made it one of the most famous in Catullus' book. To reconstruct the piece, to restore exact line and detail to the half-divined beauties of the blurred design—this is an ambition which may excuse some temerities of conjecture.

And since the diseased area is large, I shall offer a cumulative argument in which the probabilities of correction at each vitiated point strengthen each other in proportion as the total reconstruction may be judged acceptable.

1. The vulgate text presents the following difficulties or peculiarities: vs. 1: Query: Is *Passer* nominative or vocative? Presumably vocative: at least, so all editors have taken it. But if vocative, is it not very surprising that after throwing this extra high light on the addressee of the poem, Catullus lets him fall so far in the shade that, except a single *tecum* in vs. 9, we have not a verb nor a pronoun, all through, of the second person? Compare it with vi, viii, ix, xiii—for examples—and you feel that this piece has been twisted away from its true orientation. A *tu* or a *te* is to be expected in the text to carry on the intention of that emphatic initial vocative *Passer*.

2. All the editors swallow *desiderio meo nitenti* (Friedrich even acclaims it for "wundervoll"), and all explain the words by the analogy of *hem*, *mea lux*, *meum desiderium*, etc. But at the risk of appearing presumptuous I must beg leave to deny that it is Latin to use any such expression in the genitive or dative or ablative case. You can say *lux mea* as nominative or vocative; possibly by a stretch you can say *lucem meam vidi* (though I fancy it would be an ultra-comic phrase); but until any critic shall produce an instance of *luci meae* or *lucis meae* used as hypocoristics, I deny that Latin idiom expresses these cases except by apostrophe: for *lucis meae oculos* you must say *tuos*, *lux mea, oculos*; for the dative of *desiderium meum* you must say *tibi, desiderium meum*. A single authentic instance will suffice to shake this assertion. But neither Ellis nor Baehrens nor Friedrich nor any of the commentators that I can discover, cites anything to support the assumed extension of this poetical figure to the dative or the genitive case.

3. In vss. 8, 9, the false sequence *acquiescet . . . possem* shows that the text is amiss.

4. Vss. 11-13: Ellis' apparatus exhibits the great variety of suggestions which editors have made for disposing of these lines. I wish here to take it for granted that some transposition is necessary. Doubtless those lines were adrift in a margin and took shelter in a blank space at the end of this poem, but I think that the chances are rather in favor of the lines belonging to our poem than to another. To what part of it they belong is an unprejudiced question.

5. In vs. 11, many editors have seen that *est* is otiose and inelegant: but how did *est* come into the text at all? What motive had any scribe for inserting an *est* which was needless for meter and for sense?

6. Supposing these lines (11-13) to concern the *Passer* at all, how might one expect the comparison of Atalanta's apple to square with Lesbia's sparrow? Is it not reasonable that sparrow should answer to apple, Lesbia to Atalanta? Is it not rather uncouth for Catullus himself to answer to Atalanta in one part of the comparison, and the other part to be wholly vague?

Now to satisfy these desiderata in order:

1 and 3. In vs. 6 read *TE solaciolum sui doloris*, and in vs. 11 *tam gratum ES mihi*; and in vs. 8, for *credo ut cum gravis acquiescet* read *UT TECUM gravis ACQUIESSET ardor*.

2. Give the words *desiderio meo* their obvious, *prima facie* meaning, as in *at desiderio*, Tulle, *movere meo*, Prop. iii. 22. 6; *ut facile scias desiderio id fieri tuo*, Ter. *Heaut.* 307, namely Lesbia's yearning for the absent Catullus, and we should expect a sentence of the form *cum desiderio meo movetur*. *Movetur* is paleographically unlikely here, but Cicero writes *desiderio teneri* for *desiderio moveri*. I submit that *cum desiderio meo TENETUR* ("when she feels yearning for me") is paleographically an easy substitution.

4 and 5. The presence of the superfluous and offensive *est* in vs. 11 is natural enough if we accept the reading of ed. Parmensis 1473 *es: tam gratum ES mihi quam ferunt puellae*. . . . The idiomatic neuter in the predicate would readily cause *es* to be corrupted into *est*.

6. It will follow that Lesbia speaks the line and speaks it to the sparrow, which restores a reasonable fitness to the terms of the comparison—Lesbia: Atalanta:: *passer: aureolum malum*.

To sum up these details, the reconstruction will be completed as follows:

*Passer, deliciae meae puellae,
Quicum ludere quem in sinu tenere,
Quoi primum digitum dare adpetenti
Et acris solet incitare morsus,
Cum desiderio meo TENETUR,
Karum nescioquid IUBET iocari
TE, solaciolum sui doloris,*

"Tam gratum ES mihi quam ferunt puellae
 "Pernici aureolum fuisse malum
 "Quod zonam soluit diu ligatam!"

10

UT TEcum gravis acquiescet ardor!
 tecum ludere sicut ipsa possem
 Et tristis animi levare curas!

A few remarks in conclusion. In vs. 6 IUBET is a MS variant, not a mere conjecture. Also in vs. 11 for the excision of *credo* as a gloss I can claim authority from Ellis' note, "it is not uncommon to find in MSS *credo* written in the margin as an expression of the scribe's opinion on some obscure, or obscurely written and not wholly decipherable word." In vs. 11 ACQUIESSET = *acquiescet* seems to me to have at least paleographically a good deal of probability; the uncommon syncopated form was almost bound to give rise to *acquiescet* in copying. The tense perhaps needs some justification. I would render it "were I with thee, how instantly would my passion heat get lulled *and done with*." In primary time *acquieverit* would mean "will get lulled and done with;" the pluperfect expresses the same instantaneousness in the secondary time; *acquiesceret* would be too gradual, too inceptive, to give what I conceive to be Catullus' meaning.

Tam gratum es mihi quam ferunt puellae, etc.

If it be objected that there is a violence in making the three lines (8-10) a quotation of Lesbia's supposed talk to the sparrow, although no verb of saying expressly introduces them, I would suggest that it is possible a line is lost between 7 and 8, something like

"Passer, deliciae meae," inquit illa.

As I give the piece it is articulated 1 3 3 3 3. The hypothetical line would give us a scheme of 1 3 3:1 3 3. The appropriateness of vss. 11-13 as counterpart to vss. 2-4 is manifest.

J. S. PHILLIMORE

THE UNIVERSITY
 Glasgow

SOME INDIC COGNATES OF GREEK *τηλίκος*

The equation of Pāli and Prākṛit *tārisa-* with Greek *τηλίκος*, advocated by Bartholomae, *IF.* 3, p. 160, and accepted by Wackernagel, *AiGr.* i, p. xxi, has been rejected by Pischel, *Grammatik*, § 245, and Brugmann, *Grundriss*², 2^e p. 496. The fact that in these languages *d* and *r* apparently interchange as correspondents to Indic *d* (e.g. Pāli *tādica-*, *tārisa-*; *dvādasa*, *bārasa*) would seem to be ample reason for refusing to go outside the Indic languages for the explanation of

tārisa-. But certain evidence, namely the testimony of the dialect of the Gīrnār redaction of Asoka's Fourteen-Edicts, has hitherto been overlooked. It should be noticed that in this dialect we have *d* everywhere consistently for Indic *d* except apparently in *tārisa-*, *etārisa-*, *yārisa-*; but it should be observed that in these cases we have *r* consistently; cf. *per contra*, *dbādasa* (Skt. *dvādaśa*) and *traidasa* (Skt. *trayodaśa*). This shows at once that no matter what the origin of the *r* in Pāli *bārasa* (Skt. *dvādaśa*) is, the *r* of Pāli *tārisa-* must be judged quite apart from it. In short, the evidence thus far adduced is rather against the equation of Gīrnār, Pāli, and Prākṛit *tārisa-* with Sanskrit *tādṛśa-*. And there is further reason for the rejection of this etymology. Indic *r* is often represented in both Pāli and Prākṛit by *i*, but in the Gīrnār dialect outside of *tārisa-*, *etārisa-*, *yārisa-* as is ordinarily assumed, there is not a single case where such correspondence is found. *Per contra* note *kacāṃ* (i. e. *kaccāṃ*) as contrasted with Pāli *kiccāṃ* (Skt. *kṛtyam*). But it will be objected that the *a* of *kacāṃ* is in no sense decisive, as it might be due to the analogy of *kata-* (Skt. *kṛta-*). That is true; yet at the same time the burden is on those who maintain that *tārisa-* corresponds to Sanskrit *tādṛśa-* to show that Indic *r* can become *i* in the Gīrnār dialect. Taking into consideration the first objection I raised against Pischel and Brugmann, I think we have sufficient evidence to warrant us in rejecting the equation of Gīrnār *tārisa-* with Sanskrit *tādṛśa-*, and for accepting the equation of Gīrnār *tārisa-* with Greek *τηλίκος*. Gīrnār *yārisa-* then would be the correspondent to Greek *ἡλίκος*. Gīrnār *etārisa-* can either be an old inherited word or a new formation based on the relation of *ta-* : *eta-*. It is, I need scarcely add, highly improbable to separate Pāli and Prākṛit *tārisa-*, etc., from Gīrnār *tārisa-*, etc.

The fact of not finding any correspondence in Sanskrit to *tārisa-* need cause no alarm. As a matter of fact, not a single dialect of all the inscriptions of Asoka, nor any of the Prākṛit dialects, nor Pāli is a direct linear descendant from Sanskrit.

TRUMAN MICHELSON

THE HARVARD CLUB
New York City

HOMER *ILIAD* 24. 367 AND PLATO *REPUBLIC* 492C

τῶν εἴ τις σε ἴδοιτο θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν
τοσσάδ' ὀνειράτ' ἄγοντα, τίς ἂν δὴ τοι νόος εἴη;

The scholiast (Dindorf, Vol. IV, p. 351) interprets τί διανοήσῃ; τί ἐργάσῃ; Monro renders "what would be your device for escape?" Leaf's last edition comments: "νόος *expedient* as I, 104, e 23," etc. Similarly Ebelung's lexicon and the majority of editors. On the other hand,

Eustathius has ἤγουν τί νοεῖς παθεῖν; and Ameis translates "Wie würde dir dann nur zu Muthe sein?" which I think is certainly right. The word νόος may, of course, have either meaning. Nearly all terms for "mind" may be used in the looser or in the more precise sense, and, in particular, words of predominantly cognitive connotations may be used of the affective nature. Conversely, words of emotional suggestion may refer to the intelligence. In this passage the emotional or affective sense is the more appropriate—What then would be your plight, your state of mind? How would you feel then? This is probably the force of νόος above, 358: σὺν δὲ γέροντι νόος χύτο, δαΐδει δ' αἰνῶς, where it would be a mistake to understand it specifically of intellectual confusion. In *Iliad* 3. 63, νόος ἀνδρῶν, parallel to κραδίη in 60, there can be no question but that the affective meaning predominates. In *Odysseus* 8. 78, χαῖρε νόω, the rendering "mit Bedacht" apparently rests on the idea that the dative must be instrumental. It is rather locative like θυμῷ and φρεσὶ in similar uses, Monro, *Hom. Gram.* 145. 3.

If we take νόος, then, of the feelings, we have in our passage the beginning of an idiomatic turn of phrase quite common in the later literature, though frequently overlooked. It occurs in Plato *Rep.* 492C, where, in spite of the warning τὸ λεγόμενον, the commentators, with the partial exception of Adam, generally ignore it: ἐν δὲ τῷ τοιοῦτῳ τὸν νέον, τὸ λεγόμενον, τίνα οἶε καρδίαν ἴσχειν; The best parallel for this is Eurip. *I. A.* 1173: τίνα' ἐν δόμοις με καρδίαν ἔχειν δοκεῖς, ὅταν. That the specific word καρδία is not essential to the usage appears from Dem. 28. 21: εἰ δ' ὑμεῖς ἄλλο τι γνώσεσθε . . . τίνα οἴεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἔχειν; and 50. 62: τίνα με οἴεσθε ψυχὴν ἔχειν ἢ πόσα δάκρυα ἀφίεναι;

With slightly different suggestion, Lysias 32. 12 has τίνα ποτὲ ψυχὴν ἔχων ἀξίος; In Plato *Symp.* 219D, δianoia is substituted: τὸ δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο τίνα οἴεσθέ με δianoia ἔχειν; where again the commentators, including Hug-Schöne, are silent. Isocrates frequently substitutes γνώμην in essentially emotional contexts, e. g., 6. 77: τίνα γὰρ οἰηθῶμεν αὐτοὺς γνώμην ἔχειν ὅταν; 14. 15: οὗς τίνα χρὴ προσδοκᾶν γνώμην ἔχειν ἢ ἀκούσωσιν, etc.; 14. 48: τίνα γὰρ ἡμᾶς οἴεσθε γνώμην ἔχειν ὁρῶντας, etc. Similarly 17. 10 and 19. 22, etc. Cf. also ποίαν . . . γνώμην [*Lys.*] 2. 35, and τίνα γνώμην οἴεσθε ἔξεν τοὺς μύστας [*Lys.*] 6. 5. If Blass had realized the frequency of the phrase he would hardly have used its occurrence in Isoc. *Plat.* 48 and *Aeginet.* 22 as a proof of common authorship in *Att. Bered.* Vol. II, p. 239, n. 4.

Lastly it may be observed that similar turns are common in Latin, e. g., Ovid *Heroides* 7. 65: *quid tibi mentis erit?* Cic. *Manil.* Law 6: *quo tandem animo esse putatis?* Verg. *Aen.* 4. 408: *quis tibi tum, Dido, cernenti talia sensus?*

PAUL SHOREY

PHILOSOPHASTER AGAIN

Professor West's article on "Philosophaster Once More" needs no additions, but it may be noted that Laurentius Valla (*Elegantiae* i. 5) had before him a text of the *De civitate dei* reading *philosophaster*. His words are interesting: "Et hunc [Cicero] Augustinus appellat philosophastrum, non (ut puto) parvum philosophum, sed imitatore philosophorum, nisi dicas imitationem esse diminutionem quandam perfectionis." This statement accords with Professor West's position on the "abusive term," and the context shows that Valla in no way felt that there was an inconsistency which needed emendation. The word thus appears to be almost a correlative with *vir gravis*.

F. M. FOSTER

FAIRMOUNT COLLEGE

BOOK REVIEWS

Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters. Von JULIUS KAERST.

Zweiter Band, erste Hälfte: Das Wesen des Hellenismus.

Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1909. Pp. xii+429.

In 82 pages Kaerst gives a skipping narrative of the events which took place in the eastern half of the Mediterranean world between the death of Alexander the Great (323 B.C.) and the battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.). It is a brief summary with some good critical remarks, but not much freedom of movement. Then follows in five chapters a detailed treatment of Hellenistic culture, and in four chapters a similar treatment of the Hellenistic state. Altogether upward of three hundred and fifty pages are devoted to "Die innere Umbildung der Kultur der Polis," "Die Philosophie des Hellenismus," "Der technische Charakter der hellenistischen Kultur," "Rationalismus und monarchische Weltanschauung," "Die hellenistische Religion," "Der allgemeine geschichtliche Charakter der hellenistischen Kultur," "Die innere Begründung der Monarchie," "Die Grundzüge des hellenistischen Staates," "Die Monarchie und die Polis," "Die Monarchie und die Gesellschaft."

The author has an astonishing faculty for putting simple ideas in abstruse and enigmatic forms of speech; and, not content with doing it once, he does it again and again in each case until the reader is bewildered and dazed by the refinements and super-refinements of his author's definitions. If it were not that the fundamental ideas are founded on the facts of historical life, and, when discovered, are well worth knowing, the frail-minded historian would be justified in withdrawing to the realm of more concrete realities, and in leaving Kaerst to the stout intelligences of the political philosophers. Let no novice in historical thinking stray into Kaerst's labyrinth. Movement forward there is none except the kaleidoscopic movement of ideas. Everything that is individual is eliminated except in so far as the general concept has individuality. The point of view assumed is always that of the result reached—reached, moreover, not at a series of given moments in the course of the Hellenistic development, but at the present time. There is no possibility in Kaerst's schemes for the outcome to have been different from what it was; no recognition of the huge mass of forces which contributed to the issue, but only as forces of opposition. And this treatment is presented as the logical consequence of the universal standpoint which all historians should strive to reach. We are told that we must constantly aim to arrange the entire past in one vast order of conceptual relations, and that to establish this is the ultimate goal of

historical science. Accordingly, out of a few leading ideas are deduced in an ever-growing *Stammbaum* of concepts the whole coral continent of Hellenism. Wonder at the performance is mingled with dismay at the obligation of having to regard so many subtle distinctions.

Hellenism has had a curious fate. First came the constructive genius of Droysen, who sought, by divination almost, to see the will and ideas of the Hellenistic kings in all the manifestations of national and international life. Then followed Holm, to whom the only vital thing in Hellenism was the projection into it of the Hellenic *poleis*, the rest being the mere material out of which new *poleis* might be formed for Rome to swallow. Niese shied away from all construction and reflection, and gave us a formless and unintelligible mass of individual facts. Mahaffy blended incidents and impressions in his genial incoherent way. Kaerst relegates facts and incidents to his footnotes, appendices, and historical introduction, thus saving the text for classified, analyzed, and criticized generalities. His history turns out ultimately to be a sort of theology for Droysen; for he does substantial justice to his work in summarizing it as follows (p. 389): "Wir haben im grösseren Zusammenhange darzulegen versucht, dass die allgemeine Entwicklung politischen Anschauungen und Verhältnisse, namentlich aber die Entwicklung der geistigen Kultur immer entschiedener auf eine Apotheose des herrschenden Individuums hindrängte." The insurgency of individualism broke down the city-state; animated the Cynic, Stoic, and Epicurean philosophy; called for the recognition of special excellences by the elaboration of literary, scientific, religious, industrial, and governmental techniques; destroyed historic continuity and made all existent things clay in the hands of divine and human *Uebersmenschen*. It put the Olympian deities on a par in origin and character with human benefactors, and thus forced men in quest of really superhuman aid to look for it in the oriental deities, "of which Heaven is the father alone, neither did the race of mortal men beget them, nor shall oblivion ever put them to sleep. The power of God is mighty in them, and groweth not old." It finally made monarchy the only conceivable political régime and thus conditioned in every direction the reorganization of public life. Droysen showed us Titans at work. Kaerst seeks to define the tasks they had to perform.

W. S. FERGUSON

[ΗΡΩΔΟΤ] ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑΣ. *Ein politisches Pamphlet aus Athen 404 vor chr.* Von ENGELBERT DRERUP. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, hrsg. von DRERUP, GRIMME, UND KIRSCH, II 1. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1908.

Since Köhler in 1893 discovered that the oration *Περὶ πολιτείας*, which is attributed to Herodes Atticus in the thirteenth-century parchment from

which all the later MSS are derived, contained valuable material on the political situation in Thessaly at the end of the fifth century B.C., considerable attention has been devoted to its study and interpretation. The historians Beloch, Meyer, Pöhlmann, and others—Costanzi and Nestle for example—have been claiming that it is an original pamphlet issued in the form of a speech at the time with which it deals, while the well-known student of *Der Attizismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*, W. Schmid, has dissented, and tried to show that it really belongs to the brilliant trifler with whom it is traditionally connected.

Schmid affirmed that the style of the speech does not reveal the time of its composition; that it may equally well be an old or an archaizing production. This Drerup cannot concede. By a careful study of its style and composition—a complete *index verborum* is included—the Munich philologue, who has made a name for himself by his work on Isocrates, shows that it is really old; that it has all the expected characteristics of the rhetoric of the outgoing fifth century B.C.—the compact, antithetical, abrupt, helpless style of the pseudo-Xenophontine tract on the *Constitution of the Athenians*, shot through and through with bright colored threads from Gorgias and Thrasymachus; that it has nothing whatever in common with the neo-Attic rhetoric. This, in our judgment a decisive demonstration, is the solid contribution of Drerup's book. In the rest of his work he tries to prove that the author belonged to the circle of Theramenes, and that he sought to make propaganda for the latter's political programme by arguing for its adoption by the city of Larisa. This is simply a far-fetched attempt to explain its spurious title. For the historical and literary interpretation of the pamphlet, and for one of the most brilliant pieces of exegesis of which the reviewer knows, the reader is referred to the second part of Ed. Meyer's *Theopomps Hellenica*. Clearly, the speech belongs to 400-399 B.C., not to 404 B.C.; it deals seriously with Larisa, not obscurely with Athens, and its author was a contemporary who knew what he was talking about.

W. S. FERGUSON

Flaws in Classical Research. By J. P. POSTGATE. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. III.) London: Henry Frowde, 1909. Pp. 51. 3s 6d net.

Professor Postgate has written a most entertaining paper "drenched in matter," and full of suggestions from which even dissenters will learn. He probably knows as well as the reviewer that so large and vague a theme can have no unity other than that impressed upon it by the personality of the writer. Classical studies have for many centuries engaged some of the best intellects of Europe. To speak of "flaws in classical research" is like speaking of wrong methods in science, or attempting to

classify fallacies. It is merely a general indictment of human frailty. Still, it is interesting to learn what particular fallacies are the pet aversion of an alert and curious mind.

The differences between classical and scientific investigation, Professor Postgate tells us, are two. In classical studies there is more of the personal equation, and yet the classical student makes less allowance for it. This we think hardly goes to the root of the matter. The fundamental difference is that conflicting scientific hypotheses generally admit of adjudication by crucial experiment, while such questions as the genuineness of the Platonic letters, or the origin of the Homeric poems, obviously do not. Up to the stage of final verification, scientific doctrines are as much affected by personal or patriotic bias as are the hypotheses of philology, and up to this point the leaders of science disagree about the ether, for example, or heredity, or the ultimate constitution of matter no less than do the editors of "the Oxford and the Corpus texts of Propertius."

What Professor Postgate calls the "idols of textual critics" are simply lapses of attention, or deviations from his own preferred *via media*. Some systematically emend too much, and some as habitually defend desperate readings of a vulgate. But all intend with Professor Postgate to "act on each occasion as the balance of the evidence . . . shall determine." The dissensions of archaeologists, comparative mythologists, and textual or literary critics, which he deplures, are no more surprising than those of geologists, astronomers, and biologists about the age of the world. Specialists inevitably view all things in the light of their specialty; but in the end if there is evidence enough *securus iudicat orbis*.

The long list of interesting "errors" loosely classified as due to modern proclivities must be judged each on its merits. Some details of ancient life and some linguistic niceties will always escape us. But Professor Postgate underrates the resources of scholarship, unless, as his examples would sometimes imply, his "our" and "we" refer to undergraduates. Whatever the anonymous scholars whom he cites may do in their careless hours, "we" are not really unaware that we cannot reason about classic idiom and syntax in English translation, or that the Latin roots in English have deviated from their original meanings, or that some of these earlier meanings show more clearly in eighteenth century or Elizabethan English than in the idiom of today. And though we may not resort to explanation by hyperbaton so freely as Professor Postgate does, we find nothing startling in the statement that "order in modern sentences is syntactically essential and in ancient sentences syntactically indifferent." We are not baffled by Pindar's "Spartan bevy of girls," or his "dun herd of cattle," and as for Cerberus' "three-tongued mouth" (Hor. *Car.* ii. 19. 31), I find in my notes *ad loc.* the comment

"Triple-headed and triple-tongued is all one reckoning 'save the phrase is a little variations,'" with the substance of which Professor Postgate will probably concur, though he may deplore the "Americanism" of the phrasing.

The next point of difference noted between classical and modern languages is, I think a false one. Speaking of such phrases as Cicero's *fontium gelidae perennitates* and Phaedrus' *corvi deceptus stupor*, he says "The greater ease of what might be called the intertransience of two ideas in the circular group (that is, in inflected languages) . . . strikes us as particularly strange in a language with such a love for the concrete." But surely this usage is a matter of rhetoric, rather than of the idiom or genius of the language. It appears with euphuism and *stilo culto* in any language, ancient or modern. Not to speak of Swinburne's "purbblind scrutiny of prepossession and squint-eyed inspection of malignity," it can be found in English without looking further than Byron's "blue rushing of the arrowy Rhone." It is a marked characteristic of modern French prose. Mr. Howells constantly employs it, in such phrases as "the girl's belted slenderness." It can be found on nearly every page of Mrs. Wharton, and is imitated by all young writers who are ambitious to have a style. Like everything else, it is Greek in origin, appearing in the Attic drama, if not earlier, and in Plato's later style. (Cf. Eurip. fr. 205: ἐπὼν δὲ κάλλεισιν and fr. 324: κόμης ξανθίσματα, and Plato *Laws* 625: κυπαρίττων τε ἐν τοῖς ἄλσεσιν ὕψη).

The interest of the paper lies in the details, and a general summary does it injustice. Professor Postgate goes on to discuss at random *trames*, and *Pomerium*, and the Homeric article, and Terence, and Agar's emendations of the *Odyssey*, and Abbott's theory of the Latin accent, and the reading of Sapphics, and puns in Plautus. A further flaw of classical research is that we not only reject the testimony of the ancients, but read it carelessly. "Quintilian says that the final syllables of a preceding word should not be the same as the initial ones of the following," yet modern scholars, Professor Postgate complains, will illustrate this rule by Vergil's *Dorica castra*. But he forgets that all Latin rhetoric comes from the Greek rhetoricians, and that they attribute to Isocrates the rule, μηδὲ τελευτᾶν καὶ ἀρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς συλλαβῆς, οἷον εἰπούσα σαφή, etc.

To conclude, much as I have enjoyed this paper, I mark these reserves to guard against the impression which it will make upon the student or the hostile layman. In his impatience of human frailty, Professor Postgate makes too many concessions to opponents of the classics. He seems to agree with the scientific friend who remarked to him "on the classical man's inattention to details." He says severely "studies in which are so many pitfalls as ours must allow no openings to error." And again, p. 14, "there is small excuse for this blundering." But in his less cen-

serious moods he must be aware that, though habitual blundering may be unpardonable, there is no single lapse that a great scholar may not excusably be guilty of, whether his name be Wilamowitz, Gildersleeve, Jebb, Butcher—or Postgate. I am tempted to cite examples from my *marginalia*. But we can all do it, and I forbear.

"Scimus et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim."

PAUL SHOREY

Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens. Von FRANZ POLAND. Priesschriften gekrönt und hrsg. von der fürstlich Jablonskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. Nr. XXIII der historisch-nationalökonomischen Sektion. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909. Pp. 655. M. 24.

This imposing work, which may be regarded as an enlargement and completion of Ziebarth's *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, has nine main divisions: (1) "Namen und Arten," pp. 5-172; (2) "Götterverehrung," pp. 173-270; (3) "Personenstand," pp. 271-329; (4) "Organisation," pp. 330-452; (5) "Finanzen," pp. 453-98; (6) "Sittlichkeit," pp. 499-513; (7) "Geschichtlichen Ueberblick," pp. 514-34; (8) "Listen der benutzten Inschriften und Papyri," pp. 548-630; (9) "Register," pp. 630-55. The remainder is made up of a few pages of introduction, and thirteen pages of additions and corrections which were made necessary by the fact that the printing began in 1905.

The author was ill advised in calling his book a history. It has indeed made a history of the Greek private associations possible, but it is itself simply a collection of the materials for such a work. We hasten to add, however, that it is a complete collection; that the materials are well mastered and admirably analyzed, and that so many new, important observations are made that the whole represents a substantial scientific advance.

The term *thiasos* in Attic use meant technically, Poland remarks, a subdivision of a phratry. Hence it could not be the *abstractum* of *orgeones* or of *thiasotai*. Hence too, we may add, lists of members of *thiasoi* were normally published without the *demotica*, which arose from the relatively late, concurrent registration of citizens in the demes. Elsewhere, however, in our judgment, the lack of *demotica* signifies the presence of foreigners; so that the distinction drawn by Poland between *orgeones* and *thiasotai* is not complete. The former were all Athenians, the latter all foreigners—at least till, in the second century B. C., Athens abandoned her inveterate social exclusiveness. The associations designated by titles compounded of the names of deities and the suffix —*stai*, and especially the *eranistai*, were composed according to circumstances

either of citizens or of citizens and foreigners together. Moreover, the chief reason for the prevalence of these new names for associations formed after the end of the third century B.C. is that at this time organizations were needed in which Athenians and aliens could mix. We are thus unable to concur wholly in the view which runs through Poland's entire book, and which he expresses most concisely on p. 380 when he speaks of the development "den das Vereinsleben von dem alten religiösen Orgeonentum durch die Thiasotenvereine zum materiellen Eranistenkolleg hin nahm." In our judgment—and we have considered all of Poland's evidence carefully—the general trend was directly the opposite. The *orgeones* were in the fourth century B.C. primarily relatives. They had long since lost the religious impulse which brought them into being. Membership in one of their associations was then simply a mark of good social standing. Individually they were entitled to registration in the phratries, and beyond doubt there was often a practical identity between their unions and the *thiasoi*. With religion they had only a traditional concern. This, however, was sufficient to warrant gentlemen of Athens who were interested in a foreign deity in forming an association under this name for the gratification of their interest; but they could do so only when the deity had been already accepted by the state. The *orgeones* thus tended to become religious. A religious association of foreigners (*thiasotai*) became the center of a religious congregation when the state recognized the cult and appointed a public priest to administer it. The cases of Serapis and Atargatis on Athenian Delos are all that need to be cited here. The line of development was, further, not from the *thiasotai* and *eranistai* to the quasi-public clubs of *technitai*, *athletai*, *epheboi*, *neoi*, *presbyteroi*, *gerontes*, of the Roman era, but to the churches of Isis, Cybele, Dea Syra, Jahwe, Mithra, Christ. Hence it is only by the exclusion of these latter that Poland is justified in making the *Vereinsleben* of the Roman age worldly and material. We think, moreover, that he has minimized too much the protective and funerary purposes of the Hellenistic *koina* of *thiasotai*. Had he used the noteworthy *nomos* published in the *Annual of the British School at Athens* for 1906-7, p. 328, he might have penetrated deeper into the true *raison d'être* of many of these earlier associations. Foucart went too far in reserving the private associations to foreigners. Poland has gone too far in the opposite direction. He has minimized unduly, in our judgment, the part played in them by women and slaves also. These, of course, had no place in the political or semi-political organizations (*thiasoi*, *orgeones*, and the clubs of the Roman age), but in the middle group of *thiasotai* and *eranistai*, as well as in the religious congregations into which these grew, there is distinct evidence for the participation of women of the lower classes and of slaves; and when this is the case with the more important of them, which have alone come to our

knowledge, this sex and element was doubtless largely represented in the great mass of obscure associations of which we know nothing. *Les absents ont toujours tort.*

Poland has enabled us to distinguish the areas of Greek *Vereinsleben* according to nomenclature, locality, and time. He has done for the Hellenistic private associations what Walzing has done for the Roman *collegia*. We need a study like Cumont's *Mithra* and Harnack's *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* for each of the oriental cults. Then we may hope for a *Geschichte des antiken Vereinswesens*.

W. S. FERGUSON

Society and Politics in Ancient Rome. By FRANK FROST ABBOTT, Professor of Classics in Princeton University. New York: Scribner, 1909.

The growing tendency on the part of our classical professors to collect fugitive papers into volumes of essays, as well as the increasing frequency of their contributions to the non-professional journals, are interesting and encouraging signs. They show that their work is not confined to the domain of what has been called "austere philology," but deals to some extent with subjects which are of interest to all cultivated readers.

Professor Abbott's volume shows that papers which do not perceptibly advance the frontier of the science at any point, or contain anything that is strikingly novel to the specialist, may yet be read even by the specialist with profit as well as with pleasure. One of the very best of the essays, for example, is the one which in the nature of the case has least new material to offer—the sympathetic sketch of the life of Cicero's son, under the title of "The Career of a Roman Student." To the layman it must be something of a revelation to find how intimately some of the more technical and less familiar branches of classical philology, such as epigraphy and paleography, may be connected with matters of interest to every thoughtful reader.

In these days, when affectation in style is almost as common as it was in the days of the early Roman Empire, one cannot fail to note and to commend Professor Abbott's smooth and graceful diction. One's attention is rarely caught by brilliant or would-be brilliant *sententiae* (although the reference to Clodius as the stormy petrel of politics seems distinctly in the former class), nor is one's easy course checked by rough places in the road. The latter are the more noticeable because of their rarity. The opening sentence of the essay on "The Theatre as a Factor in Roman Politics under the Republic" must be read twice before one realizes that the comma in the second line belongs at the end of the first. The only other typographical error that has been noted is the loss of a period at the end of the second sentence on p. 162. At the bottom

of p. 55 "the most gifted poet, the greatest orator, and one of the most brilliant wits of her time" would naturally be taken to refer to one child of Fortune, instead of to Catullus, Cicero, and Caelius, an impression which could have been avoided by the repetition of "by." Whether the translation at the bottom of p. 96 is Professor Abbott's or not does not appear, but it would be safe to wager a few sesterces that no one who was not acquainted with that epigram of Martial would guess the meaning of "Nile's salt treasure." The translations of *Verus Innocens* on p. 17 and of *superbiae Campanae* on p. 109 do not seem strictly accurate. The reviewer doubtless betrays his own ignorance in taking exception to the use of historical jargon, such as chauvinistic, Jacobin, and the like, as he does elsewhere to that of the more occult terms of pedagogy, philosophy, and other sciences and pseudo-sciences. He admits with shame that he had to consult the dictionary in an effort to discover the force of the former word as applied to the foreign policy of the Roman senate—and in vain. On p. 163 its meaning is clear enough, but why should it be spelled with a capital letter there and not on p. 39?

But these trifles, which it becomes second nature for the pedagogue to note, and having noted, to record, do not detract in the least from the great interest and value of the essays, which may be read with perfect confidence that they are based on sound and thorough knowledge. The least satisfactory is on the whole the one on "The Evolution of the Letters of our Alphabet," where the important and powerful influence of the cursive hand is noted in a final paragraph which casts doubt on much of the ingenious theorizing which precedes it. The titles of the remaining essays are: "Municipal Politics in Pompeii," "The Story of Two Oligarchies" (an interesting comparison of Roman and American political development), "Women and Political Affairs under the Roman Republic," "Roman Women in the Trades and Professions," "Petronius: A Study in Ancient Realism," "A Roman Puritan," "Petrarch's Letters to Cicero," "Literature and the Common People of Rome," "Some Spurious Inscriptions and Their Authors."

The book may be heartily recommended both to the classicist and to the general reader.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Eusebius, Kirchengeschichte. Herausgegeben von EDUARD SCHWARTZ. Kleine Ausgabe. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1908.

It was a happy idea to make Schwartz' edition of Eusebius' *Church History* accessible to a larger circle of readers through the medium of an *editio minor*, which appears simultaneously with the second part of Vol. II. Part one appeared in 1903.

The enterprising publishers of the Prussian Academy's great series have certainly met the public more than half way in offering this volume of 442 pages at M. 4 (M. 4.80 bound). The price of the larger work is M. 33 (M. 38 bound). The Greek text is the same in both. The Latin text of Rufinus, which Mommsen edited for the larger edition, and to which he had put all the finishing touches at the time of his death, has been omitted. The original page and line numbers are, however, preserved in the margin of the smaller edition. This will permit the use of the volume containing the "Prolegomena" and the "Register" which constituted Bd. I of the set, with either edition.

In view of the extraordinary reduction in price already made, it would perhaps be too much to ask that the Register (170 pages) be published separately for users of the smaller work.

The text is provided with a critical apparatus that will meet the ordinary demands of the student, while the omission of the less important readings has the advantage of securing greater clearness. The readings of the Rufinus text and of the Syrian translation are included when important. The volume is uniform in size and makeup with the larger work. It is to be hoped that the reception accorded this book will encourage the publishers to extend the practice to others of the more important works in this series.

CHARLES H. BEESON

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Greek Archaeology. By HAROLD NORTH FOWLER AND JAMES RIGNALL WHEELER, with the collaboration of GORHAM PHILLIPS STEVENS. New York: American Book Co., 1909. Pp. 559; 412 halftone illustrations.

This excellent book appears in the "Greek Series for Colleges and Schools," edited by Professor H. W. Smyth. It consists of an Introduction on "The Study and Progress of [Greek] Archaeology in Modern Times" and of nine chapters on "Prehellenic Greece," "Architecture," "Sculpture," "Terracottas," "Metal Work," "Coins," "Engraved Gems," "Vases," "Painting and Mosaic," followed by a classified bibliography and an index. The chapter on "Architecture" is by Mr. Stevens, who has already made himself known to archaeologists by brilliant work upon the Erechtheum. The chapter on "Vases," and that on "Painting and Mosaic" are by Professor Wheeler. The other chapters are by Professor Fowler. "Both authors have read the whole book carefully and accept responsibility for the statements contained in it."

This handbook belongs to a class already represented by Murray's *Handbook of Greek Archaeology* (1892), Walters' *The Art of the Greeks* (1906), and Collignon's *L'archéologie grecque* (2d ed., 1907). In my

judgment it is superior, on the whole, to any one of its predecessors, although the English works named, and especially the second, are more sumptuously published, and that of Collignon is perhaps more readable. Its full value can be appreciated only by those who know how difficult it has been heretofore for beginners to find concise and trustworthy information on most of the topics included in the foregoing list of chapters.

Chap. I, on "Prehellenic Greece," is particularly valuable, including as it does a summary of the discoveries of the past ten years in Crete. Chap. II, on "Architecture," is better than any other treatment of the subject in English that I am acquainted with; yet it needs more revision than any other portion of the book. For one thing, it would greatly gain in usefulness by the addition of a glossary of technical terms. How is the beginner to know, for example, what is meant by a "Lesbian pattern" (pp. 123, 129)? Space for a glossary could easily have been gained by the omission of some irrelevant matter, as on pp. 174, 175, 191, 192. The attempt to compile a glossary would doubtless have prevented one or two infelicities in the use of architectural terms. The apparent identification of "egg and dart" with "ovolo" on pp. 123, 129, may be due to compression; but it is impossible to explain away the misuse, on p. 125, of the word "arris," which is properly applicable to the sharp edge between Doric flutings, but not to the fillet between Ionic flutings. For "fascia" at the top of p. 132, I should like to substitute "corona." At the bottom of p. 184 "fascia" may be only a misprint for "fascias." To turn to more substantial matters, it is a mistake to say (pp. 111, 148) that the crepidoma of the "Theseum" had only two steps; see the excellent article "Theseion" in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*. For a refutation of the statement (p. 135) that "the three-aisled system was almost universally adopted" for the temple cella one has only to look at plates xv, xvi, of Perrot et Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité*, Tome VII. As for the "very noticeable diminution and entasis" of the columns of the temple at Corinth, Durm says (*Baukunst der Griechen*,² p. 209) that these columns have no entasis and only slight diminution, and this, I believe, is right; at least I am unable to learn that anyone has ever detected an entasis. I have noted in this chapter over a dozen additional points, individually unimportant, which call for correction.

Chap. III, on "Sculpture," will perhaps be less used than the other chapters, inasmuch as that subject is already well treated in more than one book. It is a conscientious sketch, offering very few points for criticism. That the "Apollo" of Tenea is "carved in Pentelic marble" (p. 200) is contradicted by Furtwängler (*Beschreibung der Glyptothek*, p. 47), who calls the marble Parian. The stele of Aristion was not found at Marathon (p. 207), but at Velanideza. I am sorry to meet on p. 269 the "presumption . . . that in the statue of Agias we have a con-

temporary copy of a work of Lysippus," but I must own that this expresses the all but universal view. How it can be held by one who has inwardly digested Furtwängler's essay *Ueber Statuenkopien* I am unable to understand.

The remainder of the book deals with the various minor arts. One noteworthy feature is the extent to which the museums of Boston and New York have been drawn upon for illustrations. Thus in the chapter on "Terracottas" all but four of the thirty-three illustrations are of objects in Boston.

The chapter on "Vases" is the longest in the book. The subject is an extremely difficult one to treat within moderate limits, but the task has been well performed. It is cause for gratitude to have so much carefully compiled information made easily accessible. That, indeed, is the chief thing to be said about the whole book.

F. B. TARBELL

Hesiodi Carmina. Recensuit ALOISIUS RZACH, editio altera.

Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. Pp. vi+263. M. 1.80.

It is difficult to do justice to a book like this in a brief notice. For it contains, in condensed form, the fruits of a lifetime of earnest and successful study of the Ascræan bard. Alois Rzach published his *Hesiodische Untersuchungen* in 1876, and his first critical edition (Freitag) of the poet in 1884. For twenty years past, the Bohemian philologist (Rzach is professor in the Czechish University at Prague) has been recognized as the foremost authority upon Hesiod—a reputation which he has well earned by his editions, and by a host of minor publications. His massive (second) critical edition of 1902 is a monumental work of the most solid description, not marked, indeed, by Wilamowitzian brilliancy or originality, but accurate and thorough in the highest degree. It lays a broad and safe foundation for future workers in the same field, as well as for Rzach's own exegetical studies, if he should decide to enrich the world with an explanatory edition of his favorite poet.

The present work is Rzach's second *editio minor*, the former text edition having appeared in 1902. It offers substantially the same text as the great critical edition, but with many slight changes, which reveal the veteran editor's unwearied industry and care. So, in Fr. 196, ἡρῆσθαι is corrected to αἰρῆσθαι, on the suggestion of A. Ludwig. In Fr. 243, the manifest error τοῦ . . . λύχνου (χρωμένους) gives place to τῷ . . . λύχνῳ. Theog. 48 is no longer bracketed, but only the unmetrical λόγουσαι is branded with the obelus. In Theog. 234, R. returns to the MS αὐτάρ. So in Fr. 194, 2, where he now reads ἡ αὐτός. In the HH. Certamen 109 f., the new edition reads αὐτάρ and τό γε (after Ludwig), a clear improvement. Instances might easily be multiplied.

Rzach will not be found in the vexatious practice of reprinting unchanged the errors or oversights of former editions.

In short, the new volume offers to the student as correct and convenient a text of Hesiod as the present state of our knowledge renders possible. Paper and print are excellent, and typographical errors seem to be very few.

EDWARD B. CLAPP

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero. By W. WARDE FOWLER. New York: Macmillan, 1909. Pp. xiii + 362. \$2.25 net.

In his preface Mr. Fowler says of this book, "As it stands, it is merely an attempt to supply an educational want. At our schools and universities we read the great writers of the last age of the Republic, and learn something of its political and constitutional history; but there is no book in our language which supplies a picture of life and manners, of education, morals, and religion in that intensely interesting period." Again (p. 204) he says, "Our object throughout this book is only to give such a picture of society in general as may tempt a student to further and more exact inquiry." These two sentences tell us what the author of the book has attempted, and the reviewer might almost content himself with the simple observation that the author has been remarkably successful in his attempt.

The social life of a place can hardly be understood without some knowledge of the place itself and the surroundings of the people, therefore Mr. Fowler very properly begins his book with a brief description of the Rome of Cicero's time. This description is a real masterpiece. There are few details, but the salient features of the city are so brought before the reader that he is able to fill in the sketch in imagination, and, to adapt a German saying, the view of the forest is not obscured by the multitude of individual trees. Indeed, the skill with which general outlines are presented without being hidden under details is admirable throughout the book. Not that details are altogether omitted, but they are introduced largely by way of illustration, and when introduced are sometimes made so prominent as to become really important features of the whole presentation. So, for instance, in the chapter on marriage, the *laudatio Turiae* is not merely mentioned with other matter as a source of information, but the substance of the whole inscription is given (for the first time in English), with various explanatory remarks, the inscription itself, with its details of the happy marital life of Lucretius and Turia, presenting a picture of what a Roman marriage might be and serving to offset the somewhat gloomy view offered by our literary sources.

In eleven chapters the book deals with "The Topography of Rome," "The Lower Population," "The Men of Business and Their Methods," "The Governing Aristocracy," "Marriage and the Roman Lady," "The Education of the Upper Classes," "The Slave Population," "The House of the Rich Man in Town and Country," "The Daily Life of the Well-to-do," "Holidays and Public Amusements," and "Religion." These topics are treated as completely and fully as the general plan of the book permits, and cover substantially the entire field of social life. It is true that the intermediate class between the "lower population" and the "well-to-do" or the "governing aristocracy" receives comparatively little attention, but the reason for this lies in the sources of our information. To what a great extent our information on the subject of the life of his time is drawn from Cicero's letters is, of course, a matter of general knowledge, but the reader is constantly impressed with it as he peruses the pages of this excellent book.

The beginnings of the moral decadence and social unrest under which Rome suffered in the second half of the last century of the Republic are traced by Mr. Fowler, and in this he is undoubtedly correct, to the influx of wealth after the defeat of Hannibal. Great and sudden wealth, coming to a people ignorant of economic laws and unfamiliar with the productive use of capital, could not fail to be demoralizing. The lessons that we of today may learn from the Rome of Cicero's time are fairly obvious and are only lightly touched upon in the book before us, which is intended to inform the reader concerning ancient conditions, not to point out the dangers that beset us now.

To those who desire a book of reference, crammed with learned apparatus, this book will probably be disappointing, but those who wish for a general and interesting account of Roman life in the last years of the Republic will find it very satisfactory.

HAROLD N. FOWLER

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

The Scholia on Hypokrisis in the Commentary of Donatus. By JOHN WILLIAM BASORE. Baltimore, 1908. Pp. 1-85.

This is the published form of a Johns Hopkins doctoral dissertation, which was accepted a decade ago, 1899, but was delayed in appearance, so that it might be based upon the text of Wessner's edition of the Commentary.

The author first faces the problem whether the scenic *Scholia*, found in so late an author, are of any value in reference to the stage customs of the Terentian age, and though he has opposed to him the opinion of Sittl, who regards these *Scholia* as directions for the declaimers of Donatus' own day, he yet presents considerable evidence that the com-

monly accepted view is correct, viz., that the scenic comments, like the manuscript miniatures, are taken from much earlier sources and therefore have more than merely contemporary value.

In five chapters the writer considers the comments on gesture, facial expression, emotional demonstrations, complex delivery, and vocal delivery. Under gesture are included (a) the movements of individual members of the body, (b) complex actions of the body, such as attitudes, movements in striking, and the embrace, and (c) certain unspecified gestures, designated by such terms as *gestus cogitantis*, *gestus stomachantis*, and *gestus servilis*.

Scholia on complex delivery include such as are stated in the forms *comminantis hoc est*, *cum odio dixit*, *cum contemptu pronuntiandum est*, or simply *cum pronuntiatione* or *vi pronuntiationis*. These *scholia* are at times difficult to explain, because the designation is vague and it is often uncertain whether it is a mere rhetorical comment or whether it applies to vocal expression or to the general bearing of the actor. Under this head, too, come the notices of *imitatio* or *μίμησις*, consisting "in the mimicry of another's words, actions, or expressions with caricature." Here too are grouped those cases of the use of *pronuntiare* or a similar word, where there is "reference to the expression of some specific emotion or mental state." These are very numerous, and twelve pages are devoted to such *scholia* under the heads "displeasure," "distress," "admiration," and so on.

The last chapter, that on vocal delivery, deals with those rhetorical comments which have to do with the power, quality, and rhythm of utterance, e.g., on *Ad.* 2. 2. 44 or *Andr.* 4. 4. 25: *hoc lentius et submisce*. The comment *presse* is explained as implying, not a concise manner of speaking, but a subdued tone, as on *labascit*, *Ad.* 2. 2. 31 (vs. 239).

Dr. Basore is to be congratulated on the thoroughness and skill with which he has done his work. The dissertation will be of distinct utility to the editor of Terence, though an index of terms used and passages cited would have increased its value.

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

A Grammar of the Old Testament Greek According to the Septuagint. By HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY. Vol. I, Introduction, Orthography, and Accidence. Cambridge: The University Press, 1909. Pp. xx + 325. \$2.50.

Three important studies have recently appeared in the hitherto rather neglected field of Septuagint grammar. Helbing's *Grammatik*, Part I (1907), and Psichari's *Essai* (1908), are now followed by the first volume

of Mr. Thackeray's *Grammar*. Cambridge has been for many years the home of Septuagint study. It is true that Oxford produced the first English editions of the text, Grabe, 1707-20, and Holmes-Parsons, 1798-1827, while we owe the great Hatch-Redpath *Concordance* to the Clarendon Press. In 1883, however, the Cambridge editions of the LXX were undertaken in pursuance of a suggestion of Dr. Scrivener, and under the influence of Professor Hort. The manual edition edited by Professor Swete, 1887-94, is now being followed by the larger edition with critical apparatus, and Professor Swete has supplied an admirable *Introduction* (1900). To these great achievements of the Cambridge Septuagintists Mr. Thackeray is now to add a grammar of the Septuagint.

The first volume of the work exhibits the convenient and attractive form already made familiar in the three volumes of the manual edition and in Swete's *Introduction*. Mechanically it seems to leave nothing to be desired. But it is disappointing to find this volume, like that of Helbing, confined to LXX forms, and postponing syntax to a later volume. Still it is a satisfaction to have orthography and accident so fully and clearly treated and so illumined by literature, inscriptions, papyri, and other manuscript materials. Mr. Thackeray's collection of these materials is exceptionally full, and his arrangement, modeled somewhat upon that of Blass, is excellent. The matter of word-formation he has indeed purposely omitted, as demanding too extended treatment. Helbing, on the other hand, devotes the last part of his *Grammatik* to a summary presentation of this subject. Here, as elsewhere, Thackeray's work is independent of Helbing's, and workers in LXX Greek will find it profitable to have both books at hand.

Mr. Thackeray finds an interesting index of date in LXX translation in the use of οἰθεῖς (μηθεῖς) for οἰδεῖς (μηδεῖς) (p. 58). The former he shows from the papyri to have prevailed in the third century B. C. and in the early half of the second, persisting thenceforth with diminishing frequency into the second century A. D. His materials might be supplemented and his conclusion somewhat confirmed by the use of οἰθεῖς (μηθεῖς) in Hermas and Ignatius. Eccentric spellings like ἐκχθρός (p. 102) might have been more fully illustrated from a Chicago papyrus of Alexandrian hexameters, which exhibits this and similar types of spelling with unexampled fullness. Yet the author's bibliography, tables, and indices are on the whole admirably full and precise. That his task is complicated by the want of a critical text and by the composite character of the Septuagint, which is in part original in Greek and in part translation from the third, second, and first centuries before Christ, Mr. Thackeray fully recognizes. His exhibits of materials seem fuller, certainly they are more clearly presented, than those of Helbing. He has done full justice to the Semitic element in the LXX and has not neglected the remains of the other Greek versions. In general, convenience of arrange-

ment, breadth of view, and painstaking detail alike commend this first instalment of the Cambridge grammar, and increase the anticipation with which the further part or parts will be awaited.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae: A Dictionary of the Latin Inscriptions. By GEORGE N. OLCOTT. Rome: Loescher & Co.; New York: Lemcke & Buechner. Vol. I, fasc. 11-12 (*Alim-Amo*), 1908: fasc. 13-15 (*Amo-Apis*), 1909. Each fasc., \$0.50.

The first ten fascicles of this exhaustive lexicon of the Latin inscriptions were reviewed in *Classical Philology*, Vol. I, pp. 420, 421, Vol. II, pp. 223, 224. These last parts that have now appeared carry the work down to the word *Apis*. Professor Olcott's painstaking and exactness are visible everywhere in his monumental work. Detailed information is so complete that reference to the original place of publication of an inscription will rarely be necessary. Words requiring lengthy treatment are *alimenta*, *alius*, *alter*, *alumna*, *alumnus*, *amans*, *amantissimus*, *ambitus*, *amicus*, *amor*, *animus*, *annona*, many of which are recognized as very common in sepulchral inscriptions. The word *annus* occurs more frequently than any other in inscriptions, and its treatment requires thirty-two columns, while five and a half columns are sufficient in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Some words which are known from epigraphic sources only are *allicium*, *altifrons*, *alticomis*, *ambar*, *amimetum*, *anaglyptarius*, *anaptoterium*, *anatiarius*, and *animaequitas* (= *aequanimitas*). On the other hand such words as *allegatio*, *allicio*, *amentia*, etc., never occur in inscriptions. *Altitudo* is found only in the inscription on the column of Trajan, and *ambiguus* has but one epigraphic occurrence (*CIL*. XII, 820).

WALTER DENNISON

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A Study of the Topography and Municipal History of Praeneste. By RALPH VAN DEMAN MAGOFFIN, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXVI, Nos. 9, 10. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1908. Pp. 101. 50 cents.

This important monograph, the first of a proposed series dealing with the towns of the Early Latin League, contains in the first chapter a description of the site and boundaries of Praeneste, its walls, gates, water supply, public buildings, fora, etc.; in the second chapter follows

a discussion of the government during the three stages in the growth of the city as an independent ally, a *municipium* (89-82 B. C.), and a colony (after 82 B. C.). A historical map, a *Prosopographia Praenestina*, and other supplements, are in preparation.

The author has studied former investigations as well as the existing remains and has considerably extended our topographical knowledge, especially in regard to the ancient forum and the temple of Fortuna Primigenia. He has also succeeded in tracing the lower Cyclopean wall, the *sacra via* already known from an inscription, and roads leading along the south side of the city to a *porta triumphalis*.

When the evidence is chiefly epigraphical, as in the chapter on municipal officials, the value of Magoffin's results is lessened by many faults in method and in details. Thus from an examination of a few fragmentary municipal *fasti*, the Pompeian election posters, and fifty-six other Italian inscriptions, he concludes that at first *quinquennales* were elected by the people but nominated by the central government; later they were more often men who had held the lower offices in their own towns. This is a plausible hypothesis. But for certainty we need a more searching and accurate examination of *all* the evidence, including the facts outside of Italy.¹ Spain and Africa alone yield more than sixty relevant inscriptions. By enlarging the scope of the investigation, too, the date when Rome ceased to control the election of *quinquennales* could probably be determined. One is inclined to suspect, however, that the change in policy, if there was one, resulted, not from "the spread of the feeling of real Roman citizenship" (p. 94), but from the fact that in the second century local finances were more effectively supervised by non-resident, imperial appointees, the *curatores rei publicae* (Marq. *Staatsverw.* I, pp. 487 ff.; cf. Comparette *Am. Jour. of Phil.* XXVII, pp. 166 ff.). Again, Magoffin believes that at Praeneste the Sullan colonists had no better rights than the old settlers (see Cic. *Pro P. Sulla* 61 for the situation at Pompeii), but of his three arguments only one will stand inspection.

The material of the book is at times badly arranged (e. g., pp. 88-91), the English often faulty. Many minor errors have been noted, of which the following are typical: P. 19, end: no proof is given for a feud with Cave in ancient times. P. 87: the aedileship is often repeated; see the case cited on p. 91. P. 89: the last line mistranslates Dessau 6598. P. 91: the inscription cited in paragraph 5 proves nothing, since Decius held three other offices in Aquinum after removing from Verona. P. 93, l. 23: the only cases discussed (p. 87) are exceptions to this conclusion.

MARY BRADFORD PEAKS

VASSAR COLLEGE

¹Since the above was written, Dr. Magoffin has courteously allowed the reviewer to read the manuscript of a forthcoming article on the *quinquennales* in which full lists are given.

A Mexican-Aryan Comparative Vocabulary. The Radicals of the Mexican or Nahuatl Language with Their Cognates in the Aryan Languages of the Old World, chiefly Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Germanic. By T. S. DENISON, A.M., Author of *Mexican in Aryan Phonology*, and *The Primitive Aryans of America*. Chicago: T. S. Denison, Publisher, 1909.

In the introduction the author explains why his discovery, already made known in his previous publications, that "Mexican is an Aryan language closely akin to Sanskrit and Avestan but more primitive than either, in fact Aryan of the protoethnic period," has not received appropriate recognition among scholars or in the daily press. To one who is convinced that "the proofs are just as good that Mexican is Aryan as they are that English is Aryan" the reason can only be that "radically new ideas make way slowly" and that "incredulous silence or caviling opposition is what great discoveries have invariably encountered." A colleague of the reviewer's is quoted to the effect that philologists should either accept the work or try to refute it, and the author rules out the excuse of "too busy" by stating that "any comparative philologist may decide in an hour's time as to the value of the work, and it is not necessary to understand Mexican." With this encouragement, and in view of the strong plea for attention from a man of evidently serious purpose, the reviewer has perused this vocabulary and reached the conclusion that the author's thesis is just as irrefutable as the demonstration of kinship of all languages of the earth which was published some years ago by the Italian Trombetti, and which was not denied exploitation in the Italian press. One is disappointed at the small percentage of really striking coincidences, such as might rank with the famous equations of Lycian *lada* 'woman' with English *lady*, or Mexican *teotl* 'god' with Greek *θεός* (our author prefers to connect *teotl* with Latin *deus*, etc.). The great majority of the comparisons are so far-fetched that they fail even to excite "hostile surprise" or to add anything to the statistics of coincidence.

C. D. BUCK

The Acropolis of Athens. By MARTIN L. D'OOGHE. New York: Macmillan, 1908. pp. xx+405+v. \$4.00 net.

This book, "a labor of love" and the fruit of years of painstaking study, is the most exhaustive and interesting account that has yet been published of the Acropolis and its monuments, and will be of lasting service. The author says in his preface that the book "is an attempt to give a summary of the most important contributions to this history [of

the Acropolis] and to state the results of personal study of this site and of the ruins upon it." In the matter of choice between a topographical and a chronological order of treatment, "the historical has generally been given the preference," and the chapters discuss (1) the natural features of the Acropolis, (2) the earliest historic period, (3) from the Persian destruction to the age of Pericles, (4) the age of Pericles, (5) the buildings of the southern slope, (6) the Hellenistic and Roman period, and (7) from the close of the Roman period to the present time. The body of the text is followed by a few pages of notes and three appendices containing (1) a statement of the sources, excerpts from Frazer's translation of Pausanias' account of the Acropolis, and a bibliography, (2) a critical résumé of Professor White's article on the Pelargicum, and (3) a discussion of the old Athena Temple. Professor D'Ooge has read to good effect the voluminous literature concerning the Acropolis, but the book is more than a compilation, though in places one might wish for a fuller statement of the author's own views rather than a balancing of the divergent opinions of others.

To discuss or even to summarize Mr. D'Ooge's conclusions touching the numerous moot points would carry one beyond present limits. This volume reminds us how much must yet be done, but in the supposedly unsettled state of Athenian topography it is refreshing to consider how much after all is certain and how nearly scholars are in agreement upon most questions. At least it is pleasanter to be optimistic.

Views opposed to his own Mr. D'Ooge treats with all due respect, but it is a bit amusing to read (p. 239): "It is perhaps worth the while to state briefly the view of those scholars" who believe in a raised stage! A few valuable studies, such as Furtwängler's reconstruction of the pediments of the earliest Athena temple and Petersen's latest investigation of the Opisthodomus, might have been mentioned. But nearly everything available up to the date of publication, including Dr. Dörpfeld's redating of the early Parthenon and his theory of an unfinished Erechtheum, has been presented, the latter perhaps too fully, considering its uncertainty.

Errors are ever unavoidable. The statement (p. 32) that "the main entrance [of the Acropolis] at the time of building the Propylaea must have been a little northwest of the present entrance" is scarcely correct; nor is it likely that the metopes of the Parthenon (p. 124) were "dropped from above into the grooves." The head of an ephebus (Fig. 46) is wrongly called "bronze" (p. 106), apparently from a misunderstanding of Gardner's *Greek Sculpture*, p. 189. Dörpfeld's last investigations of the great theater were in 1895, not 1886 (p. 231). The caryatid substituted for the one removed by Lord Elgin is not a "plaster cast" (p. 325; cf. p. 201). The occurrence of a lacuna in Pausanias in the Athena Ergane passage is hardly to be affirmed (p. 288) without qualification. The

"secret passageway" (p. 30) and the "cave of Aglauros" (p. 10) are not to be proved from Herodotus and Pausanias (cf. note 11, p. 332, and Robert, *Pausanias als Schriftsteller*, p. 317); but doubtless opinions must differ on this point.

The illustrations of the book are abundant, and their selection is far better than their printing. The "makeready" leaves something to be desired, and the "photogravures" appear to a novice like good half-tones rather than intaglio prints—unless the meaning of "photogravures" has changed. Fig. 9 is repeated as Fig. 86, and not all the cuts are attributed to the proper source. Fig. 29 is wrongly inscribed, "Foundation Walls of the Parthenon." Some of the plans might better have been redrawn to fit the theories of the text. The use of plans from Jahn-Michaelis has occasionally led the author into unwarranted explanations. For example, on the back of Plan I, *c*, *f*, and *h* are misleading, while *m* is wrong (cf. p. 12, Figs. 129 and 130, and *Amer. Jour. Arch.* VIII, 69). The folding plan of the Acropolis, Plan VII (from Middleton's supplement to *Jour. Hellen. Studies*), is quoted as VI on p. 82 and elsewhere. The primary, rather than secondary, sources for cuts (e.g., Fig. 130), would have been more helpful.

The English of the text is sometimes open to cavil, as, p. 111: "to rebuild the great temple in honor of the patron-goddess of the state that had been burnt by the barbarians;" p. 112: "demurred to the large outlay;" p. 120: "lies plumb;" p. 151: "impersonations of nature;" and p. 280: "twilled petticoats," which is a trifle modern for archaeological use.

The spelling of proper names—"Nicodemus" along with "Neaichmos" in the same paragraph (p. 35), "Pelargicon or Pelasgicum" (p. 24), "Herceios" (p. 16), and the like—is little short of capricious. A thousand pities that English-speaking scholars cannot agree in this matter!

But these are but "flies in the precious ointment." The book is excellent.

CHARLES H. WELLER

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Catalogue of Bronzes, etc., in Field Museum of Natural History Reproduced from Originals in the National Museum of Naples. By F. B. TARBELL. Field Museum of Natural History, Publication 130; Anthropological Series, Vol. VII, No. 3. Chicago, 1909. Pp. 99-144; Pls. xxxvi-cxvii.

The Field Museum possesses a collection of about three hundred reproductions of objects, almost exclusively bronze, the originals of which are in the museum at Naples. These originals are household utensils and furniture, for the most part of Roman date, though a few are earlier. They were found, with few exceptions, at Herculaneum,

Pompeii, Stabiae, and other cities of Campania. Since no good illustrated catalogue of the originals exists, it has seemed worth while to publish an elaborate catalogue of the reproductions. Each object is represented in halftone and briefly described. Each class of objects, e. g., couches, lamps, water-heaters, is introduced, if necessary, by a brief explanatory note. For each piece the inventory number attached to it in the Naples museum is given, and the place where the original was found is given when it is known. It would in some cases have been worth while to add the size of the object described, since there is no indication whether the illustrations are all on the same scale, or not. The catalogue is evidently written with the greatest care and accuracy, and the illustrations are excellent. The book might well find a place in school and college libraries as furnishing illustrative material for the study of Roman life.

HAROLD N. FOWLER

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Herakleitos von Ephesos griechisch und deutsch. Von HERMANN DIELS. Zweite Auflage. Berlin: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1909. Pp. xvi + 83. M. 3.20.

The first edition of this work appeared in 1901 as a sample of what the author proposed to do in his *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, rather than as an independent publication; yet it was received with such favor that a new edition is now required. In the interval much the same material has been published in two editions of the *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. He who peruses attentively the four successive editions of Heraclitus will note with admiration the loving care with which the distinguished editor has sought to revise and improve his work. Hardly a page of the latest edition remains as it was in the first; yet the changes are not revolutionary, but register the natural growth in insight which comes to the open-minded scholar bent on the discovery of truth.

The Introduction has been subjected to a careful revision. Besides the addition of a number of notes we may notice two changes. Epicharmus, fr. 2, is no longer cited (p. xii, n. 1) as yielding a *terminus ante quem* for the date of Heraclitus' book, because its genuineness is not above suspicion; and the effective summary of the philosophy of Heraclitus (pp. ix f.) is considerably enlarged. The matter of the remainder of the book (excepting the notes, which here appear, as in the first edition, at the foot of the page) is in general arranged in the order adopted in the *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. The translations, however, face the Greek text instead of being set beneath it. In addition to the fragments, genuine and dubious, the entire passage from Hippocrates' *De victu* (i. 3-24) is now translated; the remaining selections classed as "Imita-

tion," like the biographical and the doxographical reports, still await that favor. Another novelty certain of a glad welcome is the addition of marginal cross-references, especially in the first and last divisions, greatly increasing the value of the book to the student. They might be profitably increased, and if the same addition were made to the *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* it would multiply many times the usefulness of that work.

In noting other changes I shall perhaps best consult the convenience of the student by comparing this edition with the second edition of the *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Diog. ix. 6 δυνάμενοι <συνεῖναι μόνοι> (4. 16): δ. <μόνοι> (V.² 55. 2); under A 10, Arist. *Phys.* Γ 5. 205^a 3 and Plut. *De def. orac.* 12. p. 415 F are added after *De caelo* A 10. 279^b 12, as evidence for the ἐκπύρωσις, now constituting section 10^a, the remainder of section 10 (V.² 58. 45) becoming 10^b; under A 12 (V.² 59. 3) Plotin. *Enn.* ii. 1, 2 is added; *ibid.* (V.² 59. 12) καὶ τὰς περικλίσεις is omitted; under A 21 (V.² 61. 16) is added: "Theodoret. *Gr. Aff. c.* xi. 7 erklärt dies falsch τὸ τοῖνυν ἐκάστῳ ἀρίσκον, ἥδὲ τε καὶ ἀξιέραστον, οὗτος ὠρίσατο τέλος. Vgl. B 110." This is more satisfactory than the corresponding note in V.² 661. Fr. 17, Bergk's ὁκοῖσις is adopted for ὁκόσοις (V.² 65. 8). Fr. 26, Diels adopts the punctuation of E. Schwartz, ζῶν δέ· ἅπτεται for ζῶν δὲ ἅπτεται (V.² 66. 8), presenting a sentence more difficult to phrase than that which Aristotle noted. On βαθὺς (for βαθύν?) in fr. 45 (V.² 68. 19) Diels asks: liegt etwa βαθὺ δὲ zugrunde?" Similarly in fr. 51, on ὁμολογείν Miller: ὁμολογεῖν MSS he suggests: "Etwas ὁμολογεῖ ἐν wie Plato *Symp.* 187 A?" On fr. 117 ὅκη βαίνει he adds: "Wohl besser βαίνει: wohin er zu gehen hat." A new fragment is added to the list as 125^a: Tzetzes ad Aristoph. *Plut.* 88 [Ambros., Paris.]: τυφλὸν δὲ τὸν Πλούτων ποιεῖ ὡς οὐκ ἀρετῆς κακίας δὲ παραιτίου [sc. τοῦ πλούτου]. ὅθεν καὶ Ἡ. ὁ Ἐφέσιος ἀρώμενος Ἐφεσίοις, οὐκ ἐπενχόμενος· μὴ ἐπιλίποι ὑμᾶς πλοῦτος, ἔφη, Ἐφέσιοι, ἐν' ἐξελέγχοιθε (sic) πονηρεῦόμενοι. The text of fr. 128 has been much changed; to this I will recur presently. On pp. 52-54 Diels now adds (with translation) chaps. 3 and 4 to the excerpt from Hippocrates *De victu*. For ἡ τροφή μὴδὲ χώραν (V.² 82. 22) he now reads ἡ χώρα μὴδὲ τροφήν (60. 2). To this passage also I will recur presently. For αἱ δὲ [πρὸς τὴν ζέω περιφορὰν] (V.² 83. 18) Diels now reads αἱ δὲ <ὡς> πρὸς τὴν ζέω περιφορὴν (64. 2); after περαίνουσαι (V.² 83. 19) he inserts <πρὸς τὰς ἐτέρας, ἡλίον δύνανται> (64. 4); for δειζώντα (V.² 86. 31), we now read δαί ζώοντα (75. 18); and for περιχορεύοντα (V.² 86. 42), περιχωρεύοντα (76. 6).

In the translation of the fragments Professor Diels has likewise made many changes, among which we may note the following: Fr. 1, after "Wort" (V.² 61. 36) insert "(Weltgesetz)"; after "Wort" (*ibid.* 38) insert "(Gesetz)"; for "auslegend und deutend" (V.² 62. 23), read "zerlegend und ausdeutend." Fr. 2, after "Wort" (V.² 62. 27) insert "(Weltgesetz)." Fr. 17, for "Denn viele hegen nicht solche Gedanken nach alledem, was

ihnen begegnet" (V.² 65. 26), read: "Die meisten denken nicht solches, wie es ihnen gerade aufstösst." Fr. 26 now receives a new rendering in conformity with the punctuation of E. Schwartz: "Der Mensch zündet sich in der Nacht ein Licht an, wann er gestorben ist und doch lebt. Er berührt den Toten im Schlummer, wann sein Augenlicht erlischt; im Wachen berührt er den Schlummernden." Fr. 74, for "gelernt," read "überkommen." Fr. 78, for "kennt keine Zwecke," read "hat keine Einsichten." I may note here that Diels has recently (in his article *Die Anfänge der Philologie bei den Griechen*, Neue Jahrb. für das kl. Altertum, 1910, p. 10, n. 2) corrected an error in his translation of Hippocr. *De victu* i. 18 (68. 25), substituting "Laute" for "Töne," and referring to Xen. *Mem.* i. 4. 12.

Nowhere has Professor Diels given better evidence of his continued interest in the thought of Heraclitus than in the notes subjoined to the fragments. These, although still kept within the bounds set by their purpose, have been much improved and extended. Every student of the philosopher will profit by the wealth of suggestion contained in them; but we cannot here dwell upon the interpretation, which requires more space than may fairly be given to a review. I may be permitted instead to offer comments and suggestions on a few texts.

In *Aetius* i. 3. 11 (p. 9; *Dox.* 284^a 7) Döhner's χύσει for φύσει appears to me quite certain; I should say the same in regard to Weil's conjecture γινώσκοντες for γινώσκων in fr. 5. For fr. 33 νόμος καὶ βουλὴ πείθεσθαι ἐνός, cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 43. In fr. 67 Diels renders ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἐκάστου with "das . . . nach eines jeglichen Wohlempfindung so oder so benannt wird." This would seem to refer ἐκάστου to the percipient. Burnet's rendering "is named according to the savour of each" is clearly right; "each" referring to the several ingredients "mingled" with the fire. Such is the logic of the context, and such the obvious implication of the passages cited in illustration by Professor Diels. Schuster's argument on the requirements of fr. 80 is convincing; if we do not accept his conjecture καὶ καταχρώμενα, I would suggest καὶ χειρώμενα. In fr. 82 (from Plato *Hippias Maj.* 289 A) Burnet and Diels follow Bekker in reading ἀνθρώπων γένη for ἄλλω γένη of the MSS. But Plotinus *Enn.* vi. 3 has ἐτέρω γένη. Even if he derived his illustration from Plato, his text shows that ἄλλω is old. While therefore the ἄλλω or ἕτερον γένος is almost certainly ἀνθρώπων γένος (cf. Arist. *Top.* 117^b 17) it does not follow that ἀνθρώπων stood in the text. Fr. 120 has occasioned scholars a deal of trouble. It reads: ἡοῦς καὶ ἐσπέρας τέρματα ἢ ἄρκτος καὶ ἀντίον τῆς ἄρκτου οὐρος αἰθρίου Διός. What is the οὐρος αἰθρίου Διός? I suggest that it is the South wind. Διὸς οὐρος is a Homeric phrase (*Od.* ε 176, ο 296, *H. Apoll.* 427) and means a wind of heaven. The adjective αἰθριος is a familiar epithet of Zeus as the sky-god. Accordingly I should translate the fragment thus: "The boundary of (i. e., between) dawn and evening (i. e.,

East and West) is the Bear and the wind of heaven opposite the Bear." This suggestion may at first blush appear somewhat strange, but a moment's reflection will, I think, make it seem not unlikely. To "box the compass" among the later Greeks meant to tell the winds of heaven. On this see Gilbert *Die meteorologischen Theorien des griechischen Altertums*, Part II, chap. vii, "Windsysteme." In the earlier days, however, the exact definition of the "quarters" of the winds was unknown, and in particular it would have been impossible accurately to describe the meridian in terms of the winds, which nevertheless served popularly for the purpose. The difficulty lay in the fact that to the popular mind the "meridian" (so to speak) ran from N.W. to S.E. because of the intimate association of north with west and of south with east. Heraclitus, then, seizing upon the Bear as the true north, expresses the south end of the meridian line indefinitely by calling it "the wind of heaven opposite the Bear." Fr. 128 Diels has now come back nearly to his first text, after wide departures in V.² He now reads: δαϊμόνων ἀγάλμασιν εἶχονται οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, ὥσπερ ἀκούειν, οὐκ ἀποδιδόουσιν, ὥσπερ οὐκ ἀπαιτοῖεν and translates: "Sie beten zu den Götterbildern, die nicht hören können, als ob sie Gehör hätten, die nichts leisten, nichts fordern können (!)." If one regards these words as a "christliche Erweiterung von B 5," as Diels does, they present little difficulty. I should place a colon after ἀκούειν and take ἀποδιδόουσιν as = ἀποδιδάσιν, rendering: "They make vows to the images of the gods, that hear not, as if they heard; they pay not their vows, as if they (the gods) required it not." In Hippocrates *De victu* i. 8 (60. 1) I should read: χρόνον δὲ τοσούτον ἕκαστον τὴν αὐτὴν τάξιν ἔχει, ἀχρι μηκέτι δέχεται τροφήν μηδὲ χώρην ἱκανὴν ἔχει, ἐς τὸ μήκιστον τῶν δυνατῶν, taking the last phrase as belonging to τὴν αὐτὴν τάξιν ἔχει. *Ibid.* c. 9 (60. 27) I should read: τὸ δὲ πῦρ [ἐκ] τοῦ συμμιγέντος (= συμμίγματος) κινεομένου <ἐκ> τοῦ ἕγρου διακοσμεῖται τὸ σῶμα κτε. *Ibid.* c. 16 (68. 5), Diels renders the sentence ἀπὸ μῆς ψυχῆς διαιρεομένης πλείους καὶ μείους καὶ μέζους καὶ ἐλάσσονες, "Von einer Seele, die sich mehr oder minder teilt, bilden sich grössere oder geringere Seelen." Either this is not the idea, it would seem, or one must emend πλείους καὶ μείους. However, the text is intelligible as it stands. In Lucian *Vit. Auct.* 14 (76. 6) Diels now reads περιχωρέοντα. This doubtless is in substance correct; but the MSS variations (περιχρόντα and περιχωρέοντα) seem rather to favor the form περιχωρέοντα.

The book is well printed, and I have noted few typographical errors. P. 50 the reference under fr. 137 to Bywater's edition as [36] is wrong, and has been wrong through four editions; read: [63]. P. 62 the marginal numerals after 10 have been misplaced. P. 64. adn. 1. 6 read: (21 A 51). P. 68, 13 read: δεῖ. P. 74. 21 we should either read συμπαθεῖα πάντα or there should be a note calling attention to the transposition,

W. A. HEIDEL

Selected Essays of Seneca and the Satire on the Deification of Claudius. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by ALLAN P. BALL. New York: Macmillan, 1908. Pp. 212. \$0.60.

This book belongs to Macmillan's "American Series," of which the general characteristic is "brief and concise notes." This aim is particularly easy to reach in regard to Seneca, as with the exception of the *Apocolocyntosis* there is little that needs explanation, and the great editions of the author are remarkable for brevity of commentary. This selection includes *ad Polybium*, *Apocolocyntosis*, *de clementia*, and Epistles 7, 8, 17, 18, 56, 61, 73, 80, 106, and 115. The principle of choice is the illustration of Seneca's "personal connection with the history of his time." But it is doubtful whether people care to read Seneca for such a purpose. He does not appeal strongly to the modern college student, and a very little of him goes a long way. But no Latin curriculum is complete without him, for he exhibits what is commonly regarded as a debased Latin style; he represents important literary forms in essay and epistle; but, above all, his great importance is his modified Stoicism, and his evidence of how the practical ethics of Stoicism and Epicureanism drew near together. Hence I have chosen for my own courses only the *Apocolocyntosis* (for its unique literary form), chaps. 13 to 20 in *de clementia* I, chaps. 5 to 7 in *de clementia* II; and Epistles 8, 61, 73, 80, and 115 of Dr. Ball's selection. I have found it more profitable to read with students *ad Marciam de consolatione*, *ad Gallionem de vita beata*, *ad Serenum de otio*, and *ad Paulinum de brevitae vitae*, the last of which it seems to me should always be read. And for the Epistles, I wish the editor had selected 90 on the scope of philosophy, 88 on liberal studies, 108 on method, and 58 on the poverty of Latin philosophical terminology.

In the introduction, Dr. Ball has given all that a college student needs for the first reading of the author. On p. xxvi he thinks Caligula's remark (Suet. *Calig.* 53) on Seneca's style—*harenam sine calce*—is wrongly applied to the philosophical works; but the style is the man, whether in orations or essays. On pp. xxxii and xxxiv some indication of the comparative usefulness of the editions and historical works would be a help to a novice. On p. xxxiii the reference to the *Annales* of Tacitus should be either to the *Annals* or to *ab excessu divi Augusti*. The notes throughout are adequate, but those on the *Satire* are best, not only because the *Ludus* needs explanation, but also because the editor had given so much attention to it in a well-known earlier publication. On p. 180, I Tim. 6:10 is quoted, "the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil;" that may be a correct citation from some unfamiliar translation. If one wishes to be abreast of modern scholarship and yet avoid the pedantry of the revisionists it is safer to quote the Vulgate *Radix enim omnium malorum est cupiditas*. There are some illustrative passages

from the Bible that Dr. Ball seems to reserve to Christians (p. xxvii), but all the other citations seem to be from the version of 1611. Granting the principle of selection, the book may be commended.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

W. A. MERRILL

Studies in the Philosophical Terminology of Lucretius and Cicero. By KATHARINE C. REILEY, PH.D. New York: Columbia University, 1909. Pp. 133. \$1.25.

This book probably grew out of a study of Lucretius, for only the Ciceronian terminology that corresponds to the Lucretian is given adequate attention. Bernhardt, *De Cicerone graecae philosophiae interprete*, Berlin, 1865 (a work not mentioned by the author), covered the whole field for Cicero, and Polle, *De artis vocabulis Lucretianis*, Dresden, 1866, passed over little that bears on Epicureanism; and neither work is likely to be supplanted by the present book, for it is not exhaustive. But it is admirably clear both in method and statement; here and there summaries are given: *ἄτομος, σώματα, σπέρματα* are the only words that Epicurus used in the undoubted sense of "atoms;" Lucretius used eleven terms, Cicero four; and there was a subtle distinction in meaning between *τόπος, κενόν, ἀναφής φύσις*. There is much about the Latin equivalents of other Greek terms, detailed examination of some difficult expressions, and constant comparison between Lucretian and Ciceronian usage. The book gathers up between brief limits much that is valuable and that has heretofore not been readily accessible.

Scattered through the book are polemic remarks, such as are not infrequent among doctorands, on Miss Reiley's predecessors in the field: Polle suffers somewhat, Bindseil is treated severely, Munro, J. S. Reid, Giussani, Brieger, and the writer of this notice are all brought to book; yet if the statements unfavorably commented on are closely examined it will be found that in most cases they are guarded or qualified or obscure expressions that are correct so far as they go. Thus Dr. Reid's note on *Ac. I. 6, 24* on the meaning of *materia*, although somewhat puzzling, is supported by the classification of meanings in Harpers' *Latin Dictionary*. In a few matters Miss Reiley's conclusions may not be accepted: the periphrastic use of *natura* and *vis* is hardly to be attributed to Lucretian literary influence; *quasi* and *quidam* in Cicero do not "betray the timorous translation of the Academy" (p. 32) any more than *ut ita dicam* in *Orat. 20*; Bernhardt, p. 7, gives many other examples. Cicero's hesitation was that of a stylist and due to his literary feeling or to a sense of inadequate correspondence. There are misprints on pp. 12, 54, 65, and 111. But the book is a good piece of work and will be found useful.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

W. A. MERRILL

Ausgewählte kleine Schriften. Von HEINRICH GELZER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. iv+429. M. 5.

This posthumous volume of Jena's great professor of history contains ten of his more popular essays. The first, "Ein griechischer Schriftsteller des siebenten Jahrhunderts," is a charming picture of a popular writer of the seventh century, Leontius, of Cypros, who wrote (1) a *Life of St. John of Alexandria* and (2) a *Life of St. Symeon of Emesa*. Gelzer's inclination is always toward church history; but the sidelights here thrown upon the great center of Hellenistic culture in the full blaze of Christian zeal and just before its complete extinction through Islam are interesting to classical students, who seldom think of Syria or Alexandria after the first centuries of the Roman Empire.

The five following essays (II, Das "Verhältniss von Staat und Kirche in Byzanz;" III, "Die Konzilien als Reichsparlamente;" IV, "Pro Monachis;" V, "Ein Besuch im armenischen Kloster San Lazzaro in Venedig;" VI, "Ein Besuch im ältesten Gotteshause diesseits der Alpen" [St. Maurice]), are devoted wholly to matters of church history—delightful and instructive reading, but, save for such incidents as the famous onyx vase of St. Maurice, wholly foreign to the professional interests of the classical student.

But the richest mine of interest to the classical scholar is opened up in Gelzer's sketches of those two giants of our department, Ernst Curtius and Jakob Burckhardt. In (VII) "Wanderungen und Gespräche mit Ernst Curtius" we have that great prophet, scholar, man—his ways of thinking and feeling, his never-failing, high-spirited optimism in these latter days when classical interests have been on the defensive, his methods of work, the secrets of that contagious enthusiasm that opened up Olympia and Pergamon and inspired thousands of disciples—confidentially revealed to us by an intimate, sympathetic friend. In more than half the essay the curtains of his inner spiritual life are entirely withdrawn, and we get a still more intimate revelation of his charming personality and his restless energy through his letters to his wife describing his expedition with Adler, Gelzer, and others to Constantinople, Troy, Smyrna, Ephesus, Pergamon, Sardis, in 1871.

Not less delightful is (VIII) the devoted disciple's picture of that old man eloquent, the great historian, Jakob Burckhardt—his fascinating personality, his wit and humor, and the many qualities that made him so inspiring a master. Not the least valuable portion of the sketch is that in which Gelzer puts aside his personal devotion to his teacher and friend and gives us his critical estimate of the published volume of Burckhardt's much-abused *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* and extensive notes from the better, unpublished parts. Would that we could have had it all!

The collection closes with Gelzer's masterly oration in memory of Grand Duke Carl Alexander, Rector Magnificentissimus of the University of Jena—more educational, political, and historical than merely biographical.

The book is beautifully printed; contrary to our expectations of Teubner, a few misprints have been allowed to stand, e. g., *Leonideion* (p. 338), *dasz* for *das* (p. 364), *Des Vatererbe* (p. 396), period dropped (p. 358).

WALTER MILLER

TULANE UNIVERSITY

Testimonium animae; or Greek and Roman before Jesus Christ.

By E. G. SIHLER, PH.D. New York: G. F. Stechert & Co.
Pp. 10+453.

One is inevitably attracted by the announcement of a "series of essays and sketches dealing with the spiritual elements in classical civilization," to be written by a man who is now a professor of Latin in a thriving university and was formerly fellow in Greek in one of our oldest centers of graduate scholarship. And the book before us, "which has filled the author's soul for nearly seven years" and "is the fruit of a tree which has been growing for nearly six and thirty years," is really a remarkable production. For, after all these years of association with the culture of Greece and Rome, our author finds that it has become Dead Sea apples to his spiritual palate and conscientiously writes a long tome to dissipate for others somewhat of the "forced and false glamor" that has kept so many mortals in the train of strange gods. To him the primary significance of classical paganism is not harmony, or love of truth, or love of beauty, but neglect of the spiritual side of man's nature and sinful indulgence of the flesh, as typified in painerastia. To him the essential fruit of the Renaissance is not the reawakening of the mind and soul, the discovery of the individual, but the immorality of Boccaccio's grosser tales and the revels of the Borgias. For him Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* "is permeated with a flippant spirit and pretty shallow wit," and Walter Pater is only "a morbid worshipper of the Beautiful." How Swinburne, the most brilliant representative of neo-paganism escaped similar condemnation is hard to conjecture, unless our author has religiously avoided all contact with the great Victorian's danger-fraught verse. At any rate, these few sentences may serve to give a fair conception of the frame of mind in which Professor Sihler approaches his difficult task "of presenting *very largely in the exact words of their most eminent writer, in versions made for this work,*" Greek and Roman "views or aspirations concerning the soul, life and death, God and the world; in the hope of accomplishing this with greater

fairness than has hitherto been the case." The exposition of the writer's purpose is followed by two chapters on "Culture and the Human Soul," and "Humanism and the Humanists," after which come sixteen chapters with such captions as "Gods and Men in Homer and Hesiod," "Voices from the Lyrical Poets," "Sophocles of Colonus," and "Roman Spirit and Roman Character." The treatment throughout is exactly what one would expect from the spirit of approach; and one notes involuntarily that our polemical author almost surpasses the patristic writers, to whom recourse must be made to find anything approaching a parallel. For many of those godly men, like Lactantius, dealt with similar questions with a certain dignity of method and elegance of diction; whereas the reaction of our modern Tertullian has extended even to a protest by chaste example against that misleading grace of presentation we so often associate with classical prose. He thus achieves a certain enviable success: for, if I may be pardoned a classicism, he has been fortunate enough to produce a book wherein the ethos of the form corresponds exactly to the ethos of the content.

F. B. R. HELLEMS

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

The Identification of the MSS of Catullus cited in Statius' Edition of 1566. A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature of the University of Chicago for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN. University of Chicago, 1908. Pp. 64. 75 cents.

In this dissertation Dr. Ullman, who has been one of Professor Hale's collaborators in the task of collating all the known MSS of Catullus, has undertaken, with all Professor Hale's material at his disposal, to discover what manuscripts were used by Statius in his edition of 1566, and to examine the accuracy and critical judgment of that editor of Catullus. In his edition Statius cites under definite designations seven MSS: Patavinus (on 44. 17, etc.), Patavinus alter (on 1. 1, etc.), Maffei liber (on 2. 6, etc.), Meus (on 15. 11, etc.), Vaticanus (on 64. 36, 37), Marcelli Pont. Maximi liber (on 66. 7), Zanchi liber (on 104. 4), and in addition gives many readings without specifically naming the MS or MSS. A comparison of the readings as given in Statius with those of existing MSS, combined with a study of the records of the libraries, particularly those of the Vatican, Padua, and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, has led Dr. Ullman to the following conclusions: Three of the MSS cited by Statius have disappeared—the Patavinus alter, to which, however, the existing Bononiensis is closely related, the Zanchi liber, and the MS which he calls Meus, though its readings show

some affinity to the fragmentary Harleianus 4094. The remaining four MSS named by Statius are identified with MSS still in existence. Vaticanus is shown to be identical with Vat. 1608, on the basis of two readings (on 64. 36, 37). It was copied for Sixtus IV, and has been in the Vatican library since it was written. Marcelli Pont. Maximi liber was a MS of Marcellus II, pope in 1550, and founder of the nucleus of the Ottobonian library. His MS is identified with Ottobonianus 1550. Patavinus corresponds closely with a MS still in Padua, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS C. 77, and its identity is certain. Three of the seven MSS were consulted by Statius only for the readings in connection with which they are specifically cited, viz., Vaticanus, Marcelli liber, and Zanchi liber. The remaining four are those on which Statius really based his edition, the two Patavini, Maffei liber and Meus, which are often referred to without designation by the words *in uno, in omnibus*, etc.

Dr. Ullman's conclusions are summarized as follows: (1) Statius used no MSS of Catullus that we do not know, except three which are of no value for the text; (2) he did not realize the superiority of the one good MS (R) which he used; (3) his citations are often inaccurate, misleading, or entirely wrong, though in this respect he is better than his contemporaries and not much worse than many editors of more recent days.

The dissertation, besides simplifying the work of future editors of Catullus by showing that the critical apparatus of Statius has now no value for the constitution of the text, is an interesting and valuable contribution to our estimate of the classical scholarship of the Renaissance.

One of his identifications is not sufficiently convincing, namely that R is surely the Maffei liber of Statius. A careful scrutiny of the numerous citations from the Maffei liber and of the readings of R makes it clear that Maffei liber was either R or a lost descendant of R, but Dr. Ullman has failed to give, in the opinion of the reviewer, sufficient consideration to the second possibility. There are in all twenty-seven complete coincidences as against sixteen discrepancies (five of them minor ones). These the author is obliged to explain away by ascribing them to "carelessness, incompleteness, and error on Statius' part," which is a partial begging of the question. His conclusion that the MS was an old one because of a number of old variants (e. g., *al' arsinoes* in 66. 54) is somewhat weakened by the express statement of Statius himself (cited by Ullman in another connection, p. 64) as to the age of his MSS. On 64. 80 he says: *in duobus paullo vetustioribus libris pro vexarentur, versarentur*. *Vexarentur* is the reading of the two Paduan MSS, while *versarentur* is the reading of R. The Paduan MSS (date *circ.* 1450) are represented as older than the others used by Statius. Ullman uses this to show that Statius was careless in the matter of determining the

age of his MSS. But what if he were really expert, as one might have some reason to expect of Cardinal Sforza's librarian? His statement at once becomes damaging evidence against the R theory, and would go to show that Maffei liber was a copy of R rather than the original.

F. W. S.

Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde. Mit einem Anhang über die öffentliche Aufzeichnung von Urkunden. Von ADOLF WILHELM. Mit 89 Abbildungen im Texte. Sonderschriften des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien, Band VII. Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1909.

To review a book on Greek epigraphy by Adolf Wilhelm is a task for which practically nobody is competent. That is the penalty for the splendid isolation of his present position. As a historian or litterateur he may be open to criticism; but in the delicate and fascinating art of reading and restoring Greek inscriptions he stands without a peer among the living, and among the dead only Ulrich Köhler deserves mention in the same class.

Epigraphy is a *Kleinkunst*. Its output is not a pedimental group or a Last Judgment, but a series of cameos which may be placed in juxtaposition, but which cannot be combined in an organic whole. This fact has been duly recognized in the present book, and, accordingly—apart from an instructive *excursus* on the publication of records in Greece—it falls into 227 little *opera*, each centering in the deciphering or restoration of an inscription or name, not all equally valuable, but showing everywhere the same mastery of the materials and sureness of touch. It seems to the reviewer regrettable that a heading of some kind, be it ever so slight and approximate, was not put before the great majority of these *opera*. Even a page title is lacking throughout. On the other hand, the index (pp. 329-77), which the book owes to Dr. Otto Walter, is altogether satisfactory, and it is through this that the student who has not the time or interest to read the whole work, or whose memory cannot retain its multitude of facts, will be best able to control its contents. Wilhelm's *Beiträge* is a book which no archaeologist, philologue, or historian can afford to ignore. Orthography, word-order, syntax, constitutional procedure, political, religious, and economic history, chronology—everything is there. There is hardly a subject in the entire province of Greek antiquity to which interesting contributions have not been made. Current epigraphical criteria for the dating of inscriptions fall like leaves in Vallombrosa.

There is much in the common publication of new inscriptions to exasperate so exact and conscientious a man as our author; but the schoolmaster's attitude which so many German scholars think fit to

assume in similar cases Wilhelm is temperamentally incapable of. Besides, he has met in Greece too many young enthusiasts, whose first adventure in quest of the Holy Grail is often the editing of a Greek inscription, to be harshly critical of their shortcomings. The chances are that he has told many of them where to look and has helped them in their well-meant but unskilled struggles with their finds. That he has gotten something in return, both the spirit of this book and its dedication *dem Andenken meiner Eltern und den Freunden die ich Athen verdanke* bear witness.

W. S. FERGUSON

Caecilii Calactini fragmenta. Collegit ERNESTUS OFENLOCH.
Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, MCMVII. Pp. xl+242. M. 6.

The two most eminent literary critics and rhetoricians in the time of Augustus were Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Caecilius of Calacte. The extant rhetorical writings of the former are numerous, but of the many important works of the latter we possess, unfortunately, only the most scattered fragments. The titles of these lost works make an impressive list and show Caecilius' many-sided activity. Suidas prefaces the incomplete catalogue which he gives us by the words, *βιβλία δ' αὐτοῦ πολλά* and at the end adds, *καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖστα*. The question naturally rises why all these books have been lost, works to which subsequent writers were so profoundly indebted. Ofenloch endeavors to answer this question (p. xii) by quoting Wilamowitz (*Die griechische Literatur des Altertums*, p. 148): "Caecilius, ein offenbar höchst energischer, kenntnisreicher und betriebsamer Rhetor, der aber ein allzufanatistischer Attiker war, so dass seine Bücher verloren sind."

Since the publication by Burckhardt (Basel, 1863) of those fragments in which Caecilius is expressly named, there has been great activity among scholars in this field. The great need which had thus risen, of a new collection, has been satisfied by this timely and useful compilation by Ofenloch. Unlike Burckhardt, Ofenloch includes in his *Corpus* not only those fragments containing Caecilius' name, but all which have been, with greater or lesser certainty, attributed to him. Those of most doubtful origin are marked by an asterisk. Further, there is presented not only the fragments themselves, but also ancient comments, refutations, etc.

In the Prooemium we find, first, a bibliography of the material published since 1863, of which the collection of Burckhardt and Brzoska's article on Caecilius in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Enc.* III, are of the greatest value. In this list I miss Rhys Roberts' article in *A.J.P.* XVIII. Next comes a section entitled *Historia Caecilii* which treats of the life of the critic, his relations with his contemporaries, and the indebtedness of

later writers to him. The second part of the Prooemium deals with the most important sources of the fragments, namely the pseudo-Plutarch's *Lives of the Ten Orators*; Photius, a very important source, who probably did not read Caecilius at first hand but only *placita Caeciliana ab aliis tradita et accepta*; Libanius, Hermias, pseudo-Longinus, who preserves the largest number of Caecilian fragments; Alexander, son of Numenius; Tiberius, Quintilian, and other rhetors; and finally the interpreters of Aristotle and the Lexicographers.

In the collection of fragments, which are grouped under fourteen heads, those from the treatises *περὶ ὕψους* and *περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων* are of particular interest. The fragments from the *περὶ ὕψους* naturally come largely from the treatise *On the Sublime* of the pseudo-Longinus, who had the work of Caecilius constantly before him as he wrote, a work with which Longinus in his first chapter expresses extreme dissatisfaction.

To the fragments from the treatise *On the Style of the Ten Orators* Ofenloch should have added surely on Isaeus (p. 107), Photius, Cod. 263, p. 490 a. 14-24, a comparison of Isaeus with Lysias, which is quoted almost verbatim from [Plut.] *Vitt. oratt.* 839. Further on Hypereides, O., p. 127, may we not with probability include as Caecilian, Phot. 266 b. 4-8, the praise awarded the workmanship of Hypereides' orations?

The painstaking collection, which will be of service to all students in this field, is concluded with indices of sources, editions, and authors and an *Index verborum rhetoricorum*.

LARUE VANHOOK

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

